

# SLOVAKIA

VOL. X

SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER, 1960

NO. 7 (32)

MAR 13 1961



## IN THIS ISSUE:

J. G. KOHL AND THE SLOVAKS  
WAS T. G. MASARYK OF SLOVAK ORIGIN?  
MAGYAR EXILES AND SLOVAKIA  
CHURCHES IN A VISE  
NEW STRICTURES ON BENEŠ  
CONTEMPORARY TENDENCIES IN SLOVAK PHILOLOGY  
LET'S PUT SLOVAK IN THE CURRICULUM  
CASTLES OF SLOVAKIA: ČACHTICE  
COMMUNIST TACTICAL "FLEXIBILITY"  
MASARYK'S ROLE IN CENTRAL EUROPE  
HUMAN RIGHTS AND EXILES  
WHERE ALL ROADS END  
ABOUT THE AUTHORS  
BOOK REVIEWS  
WHO SAID IT — 6, 13, 24, 37, 64

• • •  
Edited and compiled by  
PHILIP A. HROBAK

---

SLOVAKIA  
P. O. Box 150  
Middletown, Pa.

• • •  
Published by  
THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

## RECOMMENDED BOOKS:

SLOVAKIA AND ITS PEOPLE, Oddo; \$6.00.

SLOVAKIA — NATION AT THE CROSSROADS OF CENTRAL EUROPE, Kirschbaum; \$5.00.

THIS IS SLOVAKIA, Hrušovský; \$1.00.

THE SLOVAKS, Yurchak; paper cover \$2.00; cloth \$3.00.

SKETCHES FROM SLOVAK HISTORY, Škultéty; \$1.00 (paper); \$2.00 (cloth cover).

THE DELIVERANCE OF SISTER CECILIA, \$3.75.

THE CHURCH OF SILENCE IN SLOVAKIA, Zúbek; \$3.50.

FALSE FREEDOM, Delaney; \$2.00.

SLOVAKIA'S ROAD TO STATEHOOD, Woytko; \$1.50.

"CZECHOSLOVAKIA" — History Made to Order, Hrobák; 50c.

UNCONQUERABLES, Paučo; \$3.50

LUDOVÍT ŠTÚR AND HIS PLACE IN THE SLAVIC WORLD,  
Prof. J. Kirschbaum; 25c.

ANTHOLOGY OF SLOVAK POETRY, Kramoriš; \$2.00.



SLOVAKIA is published periodically by the Slovak League of America, a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent.

The main purpose of SLOVAKIA is to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the Slovak nation and its long, hard struggle for freedom and independence.

\$1.00 per annum in the U. S. A. — \$2.00 elsewhere.

**SLOVAKIA**  
**P. O. Box 150**  
**Middletown, Pa.**

---

**Printed in the U. S. A.**

**JEDNOTA PRESS**  
**Middletown, Pa.**



# SLOVAKIA

Published by the Slovak League of America

VOL. X

SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER, 1960

NO. 7 (32)

According to its new Constitution, the old Masaryk-Beneš Czecho-Slovak Republic (**ČSR**) is now officially called the Czecho-Slovak Socialist Republic (**ČSSR**). Well, that hapless country was a socialistic state from its inception. Masaryk and Beneš, and their controlled propaganda apparatus, told the world that **ČSR** meant Czecho-Slovak Republic, but to the Czechs it always did mean **Czech Socialist Republic**. Adding one more "**S**" to the abbreviated form really changed nothing, except perhaps to have **ČSSR** read: **CZECHO-SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC**. The Slovaks have no voice.

\* \* \*

**AN ATOMIC RESEARCH CENTER** was recently set up by Czech atomic specialists in Rez, a village just north of Prague. The project was under the direction of Russian atomic specialists. Czech technicians are being trained by the Soviet Russian engineer Romanov. Thus far some eighty large buildings have been built; nearing completion is a radio-chemical research institute which is 140 meters long.

\* \* \*

**THE BRATISLAVA RADIO**, on November 17, related about the problem of garages, revealing that there were no more than 300 autos in Košice, the second largest city in Slovakia.

\* \* \*

**THE CZECH REDS** insist that all teachers in Slovakia break with the Catholic Church and become the chief propagators of atheism. Their children must not study re-

ligion or go to the Sacraments. Slovak teachers who attend Mass are blacklisted and ultimately replaced.

\* \* \*

"**THEY NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD**" is continued to be used by the Czechs in reference to the Slovaks. Nothing has changed in this regard: Masaryk and Beneš used the expression before the Czech Reds took over. In eastern Slovakia, however, according to the communist daily **PRAVDA**, people look in vain for children's wear, ladies underthings, and furniture; chocolate candy, too, is rarely found in the stores.

\* \* \*

**RED PRAGUE** blows hot and cold on Israel. It used to furnish Israel with weapons and munitions; also technicians. Then it held off support for a while. Now the Czech Reds have offered Israeli authorities data on the Eichmann case to embarrass and discredit Germany and its people in the eyes of the world. The old Czech game of duplicity never ends.

\* \* \*

**WHAT HAPPENED** to the so-called "Council of Free Czechoslovakia"? According to the Czechs themselves, it fell apart some months ago when all but representatives of the Czech Nazis abandoned it. J. Lettrich, Fr. Nemec, R. Fraštacký, Fedor Hodža, Stephen Osuský, J. Černý, J. Mrázek, A. Heidrich, A. Procházka, V. Majer, and V. Fedinec allegedly quit the outfit because they were fed up with Dr. Peter Zenkl's dictato-

rial conduct. After Dr. Hubert Ripka's death, Dr. Zenkl was regarded as No. 1 representative of the late Dr. Edward Beneš' Czech National Socialist (Czech Nazi) Party.

DR. PETER ZENKL signed the recent memorandum of the CFČ anent the forced expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, according to which the Czechs under Zenkl declare that the "German question" of Czecho-Slovakia is forever settled. The memo caused quite a stir in West Germany and also among exile groups in the USA. Dr. Zenkl happens to be the chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations organization, so the memo of the CFČ casts a dark shadow over the latter. This is deeply resented by the representatives of the other exile groups of ACEN. The No. 1 Czech Nazi's days as chairman of ACEN definitely seem to be numbered.

OCTOBER 4, 1960, marked the bi-centennial of the birth of the great Slovak patriot **Alexander Cardinal Rudnay** who will always be remembered for his expression: "I am a Slovak, and I shall remain a Slovak even if I occupy the chair of Peter!" Born in Svätý Kríž nad Váhom, Slovakia, October 4, 1760, Cardinal Rudnay died September 13, 1831.

\* \* \*

IN SLOVAKIA the people are being heavily lectured on the "conflict between science and religion." The Reds under the tutelage of Moscow must prove to the Slovaks that "religion is necessary only for the weak, the strong do not need it." That's like telling the Slovaks they do not need salt!

\* \* \*

ACCORDING TO official statis-

tics, 638,516 people owned regular radio sets in 1960, while 74,778 people had "wired" broadcasts. The population of Slovakia is over the four million mark.

\* \* \*

"SUNDAY NEED NOT BE ON SUNDAY," according to the Bratislava "PRÁCA" of November 27. Czech Reds tell the Slovaks that the work week will be shortened from 48 to 40 hours, BUT quotas must be met. In other words: what can be done in 48 hours, must be done in 40. When the change will come, however, no one seems to know. "A day of rest," says the Red mouthpiece, "can be any day, not necessarily Sunday, and when the Party orders the people to work on Sunday, they must work on Sunday." Obviously, the Reds will never quit fighting religion. The vast majority of Slovaks are Catholic; they want to go to church on Sunday, but the Reds say: the Party comes first!

\* \* \*

THE 60 BUSES of Spišská Nová Ves, Slovakia, are equipped with radio receivers, the "Práca" paper of Bratislava informs its readers. It adds, however, that somebody is quite negligent, because the radios that function can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

\* \* \*

PRAYERBOOKS are not available for the people of Slovakia. American cousins have been answering the calls for more, but the Czech Red regime began to stamp the items "not allowed" and returned them to the senders. Now we learn that the Reds decided to print and sell prayerbooks to Slovaks in the USA to get more American \$\$\$\$. Now they tell the Slovaks that the shortage of prayerbooks is caused by

American imperialists. The Reds don't miss a trick — and are constantly thinking up new ones to deceive and confuse their slaves.

\* \* \*

RADIO FREE EUROPE has reorganized its "Czecho-Slovak" unit in Munich, firing 18 employees: Béna, Koftun, Kulháněk, Erban, Meloun, Schneider, Pejskar, Suda, Stolička, Schott, Šklíbová, Vanek (all Czechs); and Berger-Belák, Kováč, Petrovič, Kružliak, Šepitko, and Štefánek (Slovaks). It seems that American "TRUTH DOLLARS" have caused a lot of people to stray from the truth, and we don't necessarily mean any of those fired either. Let's see how many former RFE employees spied for the Red Czechs?

\* \* \*

THE CAUSE of the latest wholesale dismissal has been zealously kept from the notice of Americans who pay the bills for the multi-million-dollar RADIO FREE EUROPE organization. Now we have it from our Munich source that the above were fired because they were among the 28 Slovak and Czech employees who had dared to protest against the appointment of one Oswald Kostrba as head of the Czecho-Slovak section by the boss of RFE's operating center in Munich, Eric Hazelhof. When the smoke cleared, Hazelhof was forced to resign, along with M. C. MacNeill, the personnel director, and David Penn, a political consultant.

The protest against Kostrba charged that Kostrba was not qualified for the job, opposed to RFE's goals, and compromised by strong pro-Communist contacts which dated back to the war and Dr. Beneš' espionage

outfit. Kostrba, the protestors claimed, was associated with L. Freund (Frejka), a communist agent later executed by the Czech Reds in the Slanský trial (1952), and with one Mr. Frenzel, a Bavarian deputy recently arrested by the Bavarian police for his connection with the Kostrba group. It is not a secret that within the past four or five years more than a dozen of the RFE's Czech staff embarrassed its sponsor by defecting to the East and then vilifying them from Radio Prague. In 1958 one F. Macháček jumped the curtain. Two years earlier, the French police had reported him as an enemy agent, but the RFE stubbornly insisted on retaining him as its Czech representative in Paris.

The reward for exposing Czech Red agents in RFE: dismissal. Millions of "Truth Dollars" collected from Americans by the Crusade For Freedom went to the crusaders for slavery. Will Americans ever learn? The least we can do: request Congress to investigate Radio Free Europe and the other activities of the Free Europe Committee.

\* \* \*

CZECH REDS seem to enjoy having their country called "the arsenal of the communist world." Weapons and munitions are going to Cuba, Red China, Laos, and the African countries. Technicians also. The Czechs seem to be the "chosen people" of Moscow. Masaryk, and Beneš certainly worked "miracles" with the Czechs from 1918 to 1948, making their nation as Red as the bloody empire of Moscow. For this the United States honored T. G. Masaryk with a "Champion of Liberty" postage stamp. What mockery!

---

**NOTES FOR HISTORIANS**

---

**J. G. KOHL AND THE SLOVAKS****Constantine Čulen**

Little enough has been written about the Slovaks and their country outside of Slovakia. But even less is known generally, even by Americans of Slovak descent, than has been made available to English readers.

Back in 1842, for example, a certain J. G. Kohl of England published five volumes under the title of "**A Hundred Days in Austria**," comprising an account of a tour through Austria, Bohemia, Hungary and the then so-called "Military Frontier." Two years later, in 1844, Mr. Kohl concluded his volume on Russia, containing his remarks on Bukovina, Galicia, and Moravia, which, as not referring in any way to Russia, were omitted in the two first parts of the "Foreign Library," but which, on account of their intrinsic value, he deemed a fitting sequel to the Austrian tour. For the edification of our readers we are happy to reproduce parts of the volume (Chapman and Hall, London, 1844) referring to the Slovaks and their country. It may be well to note that Mr. Kohl, like so many others before and after him, did not always clearly distinguish between the terms "Bohemian-Czech" and "Hungarian-Magyar." Nevertheless he did treat the Slovak as a distinct ethnic entity.

In Northern Germany, we understand under the name of Austrian every one who comes from any part of the great Austrian conglomeration of lands, provided he speaks German; but every well-educated Bohemian, Hungarian, Croatian, or **Slovak**, speaks our language quite as well as do the people of Vienna or Styria. — (p. 79).

It is not Esterhazy but the town of Eisenstadt, which is the chief seat of the Esterhazy government. At the latter town is the central office of administration for all the vast estates, extending hence to the other side of the Platten Lake, as well as northward into the **Slowack** country. Each of the territories or lordships is administered by a president, residing in Eisenstadt, and four counsellors. The great mass of the estates is divided into five districts, to each of which a prefect is appointed, and so extensive are these, that a prefect has often to travel two days to get from one end of his district to the other. Under the prefects again are the directors for each single estate, with their rentmasters, stewards, agents, etc.

Some of the estates have from twenty to thirty villages and hamlets, and sometimes a town of larger size. On the average they contain about eight or ten.

The oldest castle of the Esterhazys — their hereditary castle of Galantha, lies in the **Slowack** country, but the greater number as well as the largest and newest are about the Neusiedler Lake. The castle of Eisenstadt is celebrated for its park, and its numerous treasures of art. It is decorated on the outside with the busts of Attila and the leaders of the Magyars, — a sort of decoration not uncommon in the castles of Hungary. — (p. 178)

My esteemed companion was one of those Hungarian literati who prefer speaking Latin to any other language. He usually began by speaking German, but soon fell imperceptibly into Latin, finding it as he said so much more convenient and better adapted to conversation than any other tongue. He said that he knew many literary men to whom Latin was by far the most familiar, although on the whole it had fallen into disuse of late. He himself, as a Hungarian patriot, preferred as a matter of principle, the use of the native language, but when he wished to pour out his heart he could not help using Latin. Some, he said, carried their persecution of it to a pitch of fanaticism.. "*Et illis nunc pudor est laqui Latine, et volunt ut canes nocturni vigilantes Hungariae canant.*" With the human guardians of the night, in some Hungarian towns where they have been in the habit of crying the hour in German, this has really been required. I inquired whether, as I had heard, the Hungarian ladies spoke Latin, but he said he never met but one who was capable of doing so, and that was a lady from Presburg. The Hungarian magnates all speak it, but the **Slowacks** are considered better and more fluent Latinists than the Magyars. (pp. 191-192)

The Slovaks are the principal dealers in linen, which they manufacture themselves in the north-western parts of Hungary, bordering in Silesia and Moravia, and this branch of industry has spread thence into other countries. As the Slovaks are the greatest manufacturers, the Hungarians are chiefly occupied in the breeding of cattle and horses; and in the energy with which they devote themselves to the latter, it would seem as if they had not quite forgotten the ancient mode of life of their forefathers on the Asiatic steppes. (p. 212)

The valleys and mountains in Northern Hungary, inhabited by the Slovaks, likewise send out numerous colonists southward. According to the account of a native Hungarian author, "of all the inhabitants of Hungary, they have the greatest industrial skill, the most energetic spirit of enterprise. Wherever they take root, they accordingly soon supplant and displace the original inhabitants, whether Germans or Magyars." There are in fact, numerous examples of entire towns and villages, once solely inhabited by Germans and Magyars, but now entirely occupied by Slovaks.... the Moravians are found in great numbers in Russia, and the Oleykari (oil-merchants), Safrannitschi (saffron-brewers), Platennici (linen-dealers), glass-merchants, and wax-dealers, if they abound nowhere else, abound at least, in all parts of Hungary and Galicia. (p. 319)



In the latter part of the above we have a sample of Mr. Kohl's failure to distinguish clearly between Bohemian and Slovak. Undoubtedly his reference was to Slovaks and not Bohemians, because the latter did not "abound in all parts of Hungary and Galicia," whereas the Slovaks did.

The noble and learned Hungarian priests look down somewhat scornfully upon the simplicity of their reformed brethren. It is somewhat different with the Lutherans in the **Slovak** country. These live in another and very dissimilar spiritual element. I was assured by many enlightened Catholics, that taken on the whole, the Protestants in Hungary were far more intolerant than the Catholics. "It never occurs to a Catholic," said they, "to inquire after a stranger's religious belief, which a Protestant would do immediately; the Protestants keep much together, and are far more exclusive than the Catholics." A lady assured me that although she had been brought up in a convent, she had never till her eighteenth year known any difference between Protestants and Catholics: the former bandy the reproach of heresy amongst each other far more than the Catholics do towards them. I give these remarks as they were made to me, having had no experience on the subject myself; so much, however, I must say that no question respecting my religious faith was ever put to me, go where I would. (p. 359)

**The Slovaks** generally are handsome; I have never seen a finer regiment than the **Slovak** infantry regiment, with respect to carriage, form and martial expression of countenance. — (p. 380).

Undoubtedly other visitors to Hungary, particularly to Northern Hungary where the Slovaks had settled way back in the 7-8th centuries, wrote about the Slovaks and their land. Their impressions and observations for the most part are probably recorded in documents covered with dust in the various archives and libraries of the old world and possibly even of the new world. Until some inquisitive and searching scholars come upon them, we shall have to rest satisfied with the sources open to us which clearly prove that the Slovaks are a distinct ethnic entity.

• • •

#### WHO SAID IT?

"We are united with the Soviet Union for life and death . . . the idea of being united with the Soviet Union for life and death is the most important principle of our foreign policy, whether any one likes it or not. No government can afford to pursue anti-Soviet politics. That would be a policy of suicide, and the government pursuing it would be destroyed by the people." — (Ferdinand Peroutka, a Beneš Czech, DNEŠEK, 12-31-47).

## WAS T. G. MASARYK OF SLOVAK ORIGIN?

P. A. Hrobak

Many volumes have been written about Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, his life, his concepts of religion, history, philosophy, morals, etc. It is significant, however, that little has been written, even by Czechs themselves, about Masaryk's ethnic origin. To be sure, the Czechs claim him as one of their greatest men. According to what has been written about T. G. Masaryk, even by himself, he was, we are supposed to believe, at one and the same time, a Czech, a Slovak, and a "Czechoslovak." Then there is the story that he was of Jewish origin.

The Slovak people did not regard Masaryk as their political or spiritual leader; he simply was not one of their kind. He did not believe in what the Slovak people, as a whole, believed in. That is why they did not trust him. And when Masaryk repudiated the Pittsburgh Pact of May 30, 1918, which he himself drafted and signed — an agreement that was supposed to guarantee "states' rights" to Slovakia — they were through with him. When the Slovaks criticized Masaryk, most severely and harshly on occasions, leading Czechs and the several Slovaks in their pay would rebuke them for doing so to one of their own countrymen, Masaryk, who was, they said, born a Slovak. Nevertheless, this did not make Masaryk a Slovak, not even a renegade Slovak, as far as the Slovaks were concerned. What then was the ethnic origin of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk? Strange as it might seem, the truth is that Masaryk himself never cleared up the question.

Lecturing in Geneva, July 6, 1915, with Professor Ernest Denis, T. G. Masaryk said: "Our struggle is being waged in the spirit of **our Hussite forefathers** and has not only political but also moral justification"(1).

In his book "Světová Revoluce" (the English translation of which was titled "The Making of a State"), we find the following statements relating to Masaryk's ethnic origin:

"The Slovaks and Czechs knew that I myself always had been for Slovakia; by origin and by traditions a **Slovak**, I feel

Slovak and I always not only felt a warmth for Slovakia, but worked for it... I know Slovakia and the people in Slovakia quite well" (2).

"Propaganda, as everywhere, so in America, was aimed to acquaint America with our political and cultural history; people knew about the **Czechs** and the former **Czech** kingdom, but we had trouble with the **Slovaks**; they were unknown and Americans found it difficult to understand that they form a part of **our nation**"(3).

"From childhood I felt my **Czech** nature concretely in the understanding of the character, the views and life of my countrymen in Slovacko (Slovakian Moravia and in Slovakia)) and with the course of time in Moravia and Bohemia... I feel **my Czech and Slovak nature**, I would say, rustically, dialectically; philosophically I feel with Hus, Chelčický, Žižka, etc., up to Havlíček"(4).

But the same Masaryk also said: "**Our policy must be above all else Czech**, in truth Czech, then it will be in truth a world policy and therefore also Slovanic"(5). And despite his many assurances to the Slovaks during World War I that he was a Slovak by birth (he needed them to establish the Czecho-Slovak State), T. G. Masaryk nevertheless declared at the Paris Peace Conference: "**The Slovaks are Czechs and their language is but a dialect of the Czech language!**" Dr. Edward Beneš supported Masaryk's statement.

According to the Czech newspaper "**Národ**"(6), Masaryk had this to say about his mother and father:

"My father was a native of Kopčany... my mother was from Hostopeč, a German community.... I think that I am according to blood a **pure Slovak**, without admixtures of Magyar or German, even though in my youth my mother could speak better in German than in Czech... we prayed in German."

Professor Hans Kohn, generally regarded as a reliable historian, tells us that

The greatest statesman of latter-day Austria, the **Czech** philosopher Thomas G. Masaryk, had a following of only a few intellectuals among his own people. Born at the **Czecho-Slovak** border, he tried to build a bridge from the **progressive Czechs**, who made full use of the opportunities of free development in Austria, to the **backward Slovaks** to whom, under Magyar domination, no such opportunities were given"(7).

"Thomas G. Masaryk, a **Moravian Slovak**"... "the son of a Slovak teamster on an imperial estate in **Eastern Slovakia**, Masaryk was born (1850)"(8)... "The **Czechs** were able to build their existence, under the leadership of Palacký's disciple, Masaryk, the liberator of the **Czech** nation, on these principles..."

All of Masaryk's writings about the **Czech** problem, his **ČESKÁ OTÁZKA**, and his books on Hus and on Karel Havlíček are indebted to Palacký's conception of **Czech** history (9).

Professor S. Harrison Thomson of Colorado University, whose book "**Czechoslovakia** in European History" (10) won him the Czecho-Slovak State prize for literature in 1944 — at a time when that State did not factually exist — also had some difficulty in establishing Masaryk's ethnic identity:

"Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was born in 1850 in **Moravia**, the son of a **Slovak** father and a **Moravian** mother" (11)... "By blood and temperament Masaryk was as much **Slovak** as **Czech**" (12)... "To Masaryk, **himself perhaps more Slovak than Czech**, such a united effort (of Slovaks and Czechs) had been a self-evident necessity from the beginning of the war" (13).

Otto's Encyclopedia (14), published eighteen years before Czecho-Slovakia was created, finds nothing Slovak or "Czechoslovak" about T. G. Masaryk, stating simply that he was a "Czech philosopher." Robert J. Kerner, of Czech origin and a Sather Professor of History at the University of California, remarked that "Masaryk, **himself of Slovak parentage**, inspired Slovak youth at the (Prague) University" (15). And on one occasion, Masaryk told Čapek bluntly: "**For us Czechs**, Catholicism is an impossible doctrine" (16). Dr. Joseph S. Rouček, professor at the University of Bridgeport, however, had a bit more to say:

"Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue (1850-1937), **Czechoslovak** philosopher and statesman, born on March 7, 1850, in Hodonín on the Moravian-Slovakian border, of a **Slovak father and a Czech mother**"... "Already as a student expressed his strong **Czech** patriotism and his opposition to some of the dogmas of the Catholic Church into which he was born" ... "The next year (1879, he) became Privat-dozent at the University of Vienna and professor of philosophy at the **Czech** university of Prague (1882)"... "Turned to the great political and social problems of his day and became the national educator of the **Young Czech** intelligentsia"... "His crusade for truth led him to oppose the **Czech** romantic nationalism"... "Increased his unpopularity when he took up the defense of Hilsner, a Jew accused of 'ritual murder', against the emotional anti-semitism of the **Czech** masses (1900)" (17).

After the death of Masaryk, in September 1937, the Bratislava newspaper "**Slovák**" noted: "Masaryk was born in Hodonín, Moravia, March 7, 1850. His father, Joseph Masaryk, was a coach-driver on one of the Habsburg estates. Theresa Kropáček was his mother."

When Dr. Alice G. Masaryk, T. G. M.'s daughter, came to America in 1939 — her first visit here in twenty-eight years — she declined to describe herself as an exile, declaring **"I am a Czech and Prague is my home"**(18).

Dr. W. Preston Warren, professor of philosophy at Furman University in South Carolina, published his book **"Masaryk's Democracy"** in 1941(19). With it he established himself as one of the foremost eulogists of Masaryk and his "Czechoslovakian" concept. That is understandable to informed people, because Dr. Warren is a charter member of the Masaryk Institute of America which, we are told, was founded "to promote cultural interchange between the Czechoslovak Republic and the United States." The fact remains, however, that the Masaryk Institute promoted and still promotes the fiction of an ethnic "Czechoslovak" nation and the personal philosophy and particular interests of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and Dr. Edward Beneš and their socialistic political entourage.

T. G. Masaryk, Dr. Warren tells us, was "Born, 1850, in Hodonín, Moravia"(p. 3).... **"His father** was a coachman with the background of a serf; **his mother** was a former Austrian household servant" (p. 4). That is all.

Emil Ludwig published his book "Spirit and Time" (Conversations with Masaryk) in 1935, the 270-page book being read and approved before publication by Masaryk himself. In the book Ludwig tells us that Masaryk descends from Czechs and Slovaks and was born **"in southern Moravia, near the border of both tribes."** To Ludwig, Masaryk's character appears to be **"typically Slovak"**(p.14) and Masaryk himself told him: "Already as a child I was bilingual. **My father was Slovak, my mother spoke German, but also Czech.** Her parents were from Hana. I prayed in German, because my mother used to pray in German from her German prayerbook"(p. 105).

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the death of T. G. Masaryk (Sept. 14, 1957) the Austrian journals **"Furche"** and **"Oberösterreichische"** had this to say about the ethnic origin of Masaryk:



"A native of Hana, Moravia, Masaryk's mother worked for several years in Vienna before she became a cook for a wealthy family in Hodonín. At first she knew practically nothing in Czech and spoke with her children in the beginning only in German. Masaryk was recorded as a German in his curriculum vitae of 1875, which he himself wrote before attaining his doctorate of philosophy at the University of Vienna.

"Two facts are usually omitted in the biographies of the president, and these he himself, in his conversation with Charles Čapek, fails to mention: where his mother worked as a cook in Hodonín, and, secondly, on what day she was married in 1849. It is easy to ascertain why these facts are not mentioned, since the Hodonín Register shows that she was married on August 15, 1849, and that Masaryk was born on March 7, 1850: between the marriage of the parents and the birth of young Thomas there are not even seven months. The mention of these dates could easily prompt the thought that the president was born out of wedlock.

"On the other hand again, it is easy to ascertain just why the family for whom Masaryk's mother cooked is never mentioned: The fact is that Masaryk's mother worked as a cook for a certain wealthy merchant of Hodonín who owned his own mill and quite a piece of land. This merchant was the grandfather of the world renowned Austrian historian and politician Joseph Redlich, Finance Minister in the Emperor's last government. This merchant of Hodonín was allegedly the natural father of T. G. Masaryk, later the President of Czecho-Slovakia.

"The Redlich family was expelled during the time of Marie Theresa, as were all the Jewish families of Hodonín. Many of the expelees went to Hungary, while some settled in Moravian towns. The departure of the Jewish families caused the little town of Hodonín serious economic damage and, therefore, the Emperor allowed thirteen Jewish families to return in 1783. Among the returnees was also one Lazar Redlich, to whom a son, Nathan, was born in 1803, who also became a merchant.

"Was the grandfather of Joseph Redlich also the natural father of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk? The story is very plausible and explains why Thomas G. Masaryk excelled over the rest of the members of his family, particularly his brothers. It was Redlich money that gave him the opportunity to an education; and it explains why Masaryk favored the cause of the Jews. If the grandfather of Joseph Redlich was also the grandfather of Masaryk's children, then it is understandable why Jan Masaryk, the president's son, particularly his daughter, Alice Masaryk, have definite Jewish facial characteristics."

This story of Masaryk being of Jewish origin I had heard many years ago from Czechs themselves, the last time from the Czech patriot, the Rt. Rev. Monsignor V. F. Mikolášek, a short time before he died. It is significant that Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was very favorably received and generously supported by leading Jewish per-

sonalities and organizations, the Jewish press, as well as other institutions which were influenced or dominated by them, wherever he travelled during World War I to gain support for his proposed Czecho-Slovak State. In return, Masaryk and Beneš placed many Jews in the various departments of the Czecho-Slovak Government as a token of their appreciation for services rendered. In fact the Jews were always more favored than the Slovaks. As late as 1949, at a special press conference called at the Czecho-Slovak Embassy by Dr. Francis Weisskopf, Minister Counsellor of the Embassy, and Ernest Polak, alternate executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia and Finland, they denied reports that Jews were subjected to growing pressures in Czecho-Slovakia. **They stated that they themselves and many leading members of their government were Jews.** Mr. Polak added that **"today there are many, many Jews in the highest positions in Czechoslovakia, not only in politics but in economics and the professions."**(20).

Significant, too, is the item on Jan Masaryk, the son of President Thomas G. Masaryk, when he visited the United States in 1939, as reported by TIME magazine: **"Last week Jan Masaryk was in the U. S. . . . to work not for the Czechs . . . but for Democracy and persecuted Jews in particular. . . . He shed no tears for his lost land. . . . The Jan Masaryks are now divorced(21).**

And no less significant is the item which appeared in the CHICAGO AMERICAN(22) under the heading of "Deaths Elsewhere" and read:

**"Antonin Masaryk, nephew of the late first president of Czechoslovakia and export manager of a brewery in Israel, aboard the vessel Egyptian Prince, Dec. 16 enroute from Britain to Israel."**

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was not a fool. He was a brilliant man. Masaryk knew what he was and what he wanted. He came among the Slovaks in America, in 1918, because he needed them for his Czecho-Slovak propaganda. After that he ignored them completely. So did his son Jan and his daughter Alice. The Slovaks will never be-

lieve that Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was a Slovak. And the sooner the Czechs give up their crazy game of trying to make a "Czechoslovak" nation by the simple formula "Czech + Slovak = Czechoslovak," the better for all concerned.

## REFERENCES

1. T. G. Masaryk: **SVĚTOVÁ REVOLUCE**, Orbis, Prague, 1925; p. 75.
2. Ibidem, p. 263.
3. Ibidem, p. 320.
4. Ibidem, p. 395.
5. Ibidem, p. 523.
6. **NÁROD**, Aug. 7, 1953; Chicago, Ill.
7. **CENTRAL-EASTERN EUROPE** (Crucible of World Wars), by Joseph S. Rouček, Ph.D., and Associates; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946; pp. 53-54.
8. Ibidem, p. 83.
9. **CZECHOSLOVAKIA**, edited by Robert J. Kerner; University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1949; p. 105.
10. Princeton University Press, 1944.
11. p. 191.
12. p. 231.
13. p. 252.
14. **OTTŮV SLOVNÍK NAUČNÝ**, Prague, 1900; Vol. 16, p. 934.
15. **CZECHOSLOVAKIA** (vd. above); p. 49.
16. Charles Čapek: **MASARYK TELLS HIS STORY**, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1934; p. 209.
17. **SLAVONIC ENCYCLOPEDIA**, edited by Joseph S. Rouček, Ph.D., University of Bridgeport; Philosophical Library, New York, 1949; p. 745.
18. **THE NEW YORK TIMES**, June 9, 1939.
19. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1941.
20. **THE NEW YORK TIMES**, March 5, 1949.
21. Jan. 25, 1939.
22. Dec. 27, 1957.

• • •

## WHO SAID IT?

"We are deeply convinced that this alliance (with the USSR) is to the benefit of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union and that it also is a contribution to international understanding. Whosoever among us does not want to acknowledge this supra-partisan and national character of the Czechoslovak-Soviet alliance, he is undermining this alliance and working against his very own aims." — (Dr. Peter Zenkl, chairman "Council of Free Czechoslovakia," Karlové Vary, July 20, 1947, according to ČAS, 7-25-47).

## MAGYAR EXILES AND SLOVAKIA

**Dr. Joseph Kirschbaum**

For the past fifteen years Slovak exiles have been concerned for the most part with Czech politicians and their adamant opposition to Slovak freedom and independence. As a result, many people think that the Slovaks have no problems with their other neighbors, particularly the Magyars, who consistently refer to themselves as "Hungarians." The fact of the matter is, however, that even some Magyar exiles rather seem to enjoy presenting Slovakia and the Slovaks in an unfavorable light, propagating tendentious stories and distorting the truth in much the same way that the late Dr. Edward Beneš did, and his followers are still doing.

This policy of Czech chauvinists is readily understandable: they are determined that the Slovaks shall be dominated by the Czechs for all time in the political monstrosity called Czecho-Slovakia. But it is difficult to understand just what the Magyars hope to gain by their hostile attitude toward Slovak freedom and independence. Neither the western world nor the Slovaks will accept any plan to return Slovakia to Hungary to be dominated by the Magyars. Professor Tuka used to say that the interests of the neighbors of Slovakia will help the Slovaks preserve their independence, because it is not in the interest of the Poles or Magyars that the Slovaks be dominated by the Czechs. Conversely, logical consideration of this matter leads to the conclusion that both these neighbors of the Slovaks should, in their own interests, promote the independence of Slovakia.

Slovaks in exile have tried to develop friendly relations with exiled representatives of other nationalities, including the Poles and Magyars. They were organized in the Slovak National Council Abroad before February 25, 1948, when the Czech communists seized full power in Czecho-Slovakia and Czech and Czecho-Slovak officials soon after began a mass exodus from the "people's democracy" they had helped to create. The SNCA was recognized by the Polish government-in-exile and the Ma-

gyar National Council in London. In the beginning of 1949, with the late Karol Sidor, at that time president of the SNCA, we had a meeting with Magyar representatives — Monsignor Bela Varga and Count G. Bakács-Besseneyi — in Paris and we thought that our efforts for friendly relations met with understanding.

The situation changed, however, when certain influential political circles in America called into being the "National Councils" — and among them also the so-called "Council of Free Czechoslovakia," which was created with the blessing of the U. S. State Department then under Dean Acheson. As a condition of moral and material support, the various nationality councils were required to work together in harmony. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia was completely dominated by the Beneš Czechs, the Czech National Socialists (Dr. Hubert Ripka, Dr. Peter Zenkl). As in the past, so even now, several Slovak personalities (Joseph Lettrich, Stephen Kočvara, George Slávik), completely subservient to the Czech group, were added for window-dressing so that the appellation "Czechoslovak" might continue to apply.

It was thus that the Magyar National Council discontinued cooperating with the Slovak National Council Abroad and began to work together with the organization of Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich (the Council of Free Czechoslovakia), who not only support the thesis of Czech hegemony over Slovakia, but are also held responsible for the deportation of hundreds of thousands of Magyars while they reigned with Beneš in Prague and looked upon the leaders of the Magyar exile as Nazi collaborators and traitors. Strange bedfellows, indeed!

The Slovaks were not the cause of this change of policy of the Magyar National Council, nor could they alter it. Of course, it would be in the interest of the Magyars and the Slovaks, as well as in the highest interest of a better future of all the nations of Central Europe, if the Magyar exile made an effort to seek a more just and permanent solution of Central-European problems than that forced upon Central Europe, with the help of Czech politicians, after the wars in 1918 and 1945 — the same solu-



tion now being promoted by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia which is dominated by the Czechs for the Czechs.

It is noteworthy, though, that some Magyar exiles, grouped around the periodical *Nemzetör*, have seen through the fraud of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and are now on the right track toward solving the problems of Central Europe.

But the Magyar National Council was not the only body indirectly aiding and abetting Czech exiles and Czech tendencies. Magyar journalists and more or less known diplomats have also helped the Czech chauvinists. It is not easy to answer the question why they should write about the Slovak Republic so tendenciously, utterly disregarding facts and distorting the truth. And this is all the more difficult to understand, because some of them wrote in such a fashion already as professors at American universities and their literary efforts are supposed to be scientific works. Objectively, as far as the Slovaks were concerned, went down the drain. Let's get down to cases.

Andrew Gyorgy, assistant professor of political sciences at Yale University, authored the book **"Governments of Danubian Europe"** (Rinehart and Co., 1949). It appears to be the best collection of the propaganda used by the Czech exiles during World War II; disregard for objectivity and reliability of sources is in full evidence in this connection.

No less objective and anti-Slovak is the book **"The Great Powers And Eastern Europe,"** authored by John A. Lukacs, (American Book Co., 1953). This book of 878 pages gives the impression of a serious work. As far as Slovakia is concerned, however, the most fantastic falsehoods, half-truths, and inaccuracies of Czech propaganda are here repeated under the guise of a scientific volume.

The various literary endeavors authored or edited by Professor Stephen D. Kertesz of Notre Dame University unnecessarily characterize the Slovak Republic as "a German puppet State" and the Slovak Government as a "Nazi government." In the book **"The Fate of East Central Europe"** (Notre Dame Press, 1956), which was edited by Dr. Kertesz, the chapter by Professor Robert H. Ferrell de-

monstrates that the author has little first-hand knowledge about the Slovaks and their country. The chapter by Ivo Ducháček is a glaring example of typical Czech propaganda, replete with inaccuracies, un-truths, and distortions of fact. The book "**The Triumph of Tyranny**," written by Stephen Borsody, perhaps tops all literary works in this regard. The author was brought up in Slovakia; he was a Magyar journalist of some note, then, after the war, a diplomat of the Budapest government; now he is teaching at Chatham College in Pittsburgh, Pa. What excuse is there for the anti-Slovak tendency of Borsody?

Borsody's book is brilliantly written; its aim is a new federative order in Central Europe. He takes an objectively negative stand toward the politics of Dr. Edward Beneš, also to the deportation of the Magyars from Slovakia; on the whole he takes a sober outlook of the past and the necessity of a new solution of the problems of Central Europe in the future. And yet, all objectivity seems to disappear when Borsody writes about the Slovak Republic. He was in Slovakia; he is acquainted with its problems, the will of the Slovak nation; and he had the facts first-hand. Why then did he resort to smearing the Slovaks and their country? This was not only not necessary, but also against the interests of the federative conception of Central Europe which Borsody defends so correctly and skillfully.

Those who would deny the Slovaks their freedom and political independence demonstrate how little they value these very blessings for their own nations. What have the Czechs to gain by joining Magyars who are opposed to the freedom and independence of the Slovaks? And vice-versa? How do Magyars and Czechs serve the ends of justice and democracy by denying to the Slovaks the very blessings of freedom which they claim for themselves? It is, the Slovaks believe, in the interests of all the nations of the Danubian Basin, nay, in the interests of all Europe, that the Slovaks be free of foreign and hostile rule and manage their own household. Exiles from European countries do harm to the cause of freedom and democracy when they deny the fruits of freedom to others; they are certainly not helping the very cause they claim to represent.

## CHURCHES IN A VISE

Frances McPoyne

It has often been said that Czecho-Slovakia is Moscow's most obedient satellite. What is there about this little nation that has earned for it such an uncomplimentary name? Is it by plan or mere accident that a Christian Western-oriented country should become such a loyal servant of the Kremlin?

To know and understand another people one must at least have an idea as to that people's language, history, music and its religious development. A little volume entitled **Kirchen in der Zange** (Churches in a Vise), published by the Munich University Press and Publishing House, Dr. C. Wolf and Son, one of a series on **Central European Sources and Documents**, deals exclusively with Czecho-Slovakia and describes the plight of the churches in that country today.

Czecho-Slovakia is territorially about as large as the State of New York. At its birth in 1919 it did not consist of one ethnic people, the "Czechoslovaks," for there exists no such people. It contained Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, and others. The census of 1930 gives the following breakdown: 7.2 million Czechs, 2.3 million Slovaks, 3.3 million Sudeten Germans (they were native to Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia and did not enter with Hitler in 1939), 550,000 Ukrainians, 700,000 Magyars, 190,000 Jews, 130,000 Poles and others. According to the same statistics the religious breakdown was 73.5% Roman Catholic, 7.6% Evangelical Lutheran, 5.3% Czech National Church (in Slovakia 0.4%), 2.4% Israelite, 5.4% other and 5.8% non-affiliated. The Catholics in the present-day "People's Democratic" ČSSR are estimated at 75% of the population, the Evangelicals at 8%. For obvious reasons it is impossible to obtain a more exact tabulation.

To rightly comprehend the situation, let it be said that feelings were generally drawn along nationality lines rather than on religious ones, even prior to the Communist putsch in Czecho-Slovakia. Such an attitude made it possible, for

example, for the Slovak Catholic priest Andreas Hlinka to win support not only among his co-religious fellow-Slovaks but from the Slovak Protestants too. By the same token the Catholic Slovaks never merged with the Catholic Czechs to form a People's Party in the Prague Parliament. The 92% Roman Catholic Sudeten population, to cite a second example, repeatedly voted for Lutheran Pastor Gottfrid Wehrenfennig as the president of their Volksverein. It is important, therefore, to bear these nationality differences and tensions in mind when tracing the trend of political events in Czecho-Slovakia.

Due to the bitter feeling between Czechs and Germans at the close of World War II and due perhaps to certain pro-Slav leanings of the Czech people, it was possible for Czech collaboration with the Communists to make a bold public hand-shake in the form of a pastoral letter which welcomed the Czech two-year plan as "a road to happiness and prosperity for the fatherland" and urged the faithful to support it.

A special event that shows how smoothly the near Church-Communist betrothal was working out, was the consecration on December 8, 1946, of Joseph Beran, Archbishop of Prague and primate of Bohemia. No less a prominent Communist than Premier Klement Gottwald not only attended the church ceremonies but followed the various steps in the consecration with prayerbook in hand and congratulated the archbishop in the name of the entire government.

So convinced at the time was the archbishop of the chances for good Church-Communist relations that he made no attempt to counteract the decrees of Dr. Edvard Beneš calling for the brutal expulsion from the land of all native Sudeten German inhabitants. The driving out of the 92% Roman Catholic Sudeten Germans was even acceded to by Primate Beran as "imperative." Not until the draft of a new law seeking to nationalize the nation's schools did Archbishop Beran realize he had hitched his wagon to the wrong star. His reaction was to try to effect a coalition of all the country's churches. When the government then confiscated all Church property and decided to give the clergy the sta-

tus of any other government employee, Beran issued a statement — made on the heels of government efforts to win the clergy for Communist Party membership — in which he declared: "No Christian and above all no priest dare align himself with an ideology that questions the existence of a soul or immortality."

On May 10, 1948, a "uniform list" of candidates for the revived Popular Front was drawn up, aimed to convince other countries that the Czech people had always been eager to embrace Communism. Gottwald's cabinet did its utmost to win church support for that election campaign. The head of the Orthodox Church in the ČSSR vehemently stated that the casting of a white (invalid) vote was tantamount to cowardly flight from responsibility for the future of the State. The Israelite Council called on its members to vote for the Gottwald Communist government, believing that it meant "a chance for quiet development of the Jewish community." The Central Council of the "Czechoslovak Church" declared: "It is the civil duty of every church member to vote so as to manifest national unity." The election banner of the Evangelical Bruderkirche was much more conservative: "Let us strive for true unity in truth and justice." The Catholic Church refused to be misled by a temporary let-up in persecution of churchmen and refrained from promising the regime its confidence. It simply declined to adopt any election slogan whatsoever.

By November 1949, Archbishop Beran had signed his last pastoral letter. On March 11, 1951, the Czech State police had taken him prisoner and silenced him perhaps for all time. Paralleling Beran's disappearance came Soviet-style "scare" tactics aimed at the clergy in general, with arrests and sentences to prison. Not eager to create martyrs for either Lutheranism or Rome, the Communists promised freedom to those it had interned provided they would march with the regime. In the meantime properties and buildings of both Catholic and other denominations had been confiscated, their buildings turned into museums or Communist headquarters. In addition to the expropriation of the clergy — a move that not only meant **material** gains for the government — an added blow had been



struck designed to make all men of the cloth mere tools of the State. Robbed of their independence, they were to be reduced to puppets by having to qualify for office on the same basis as all other public jobholders. Their salary, payment for lodging, and for the education of their children in the case of the non-Catholics, all were put on the level of State employees. The administration was to approve all appointments to office and be free to refuse a candidate on "political" ground. Such appointments are not valid according to church law but it is relatively easy for the Red regime to fool a simple parishioner into believing that they are.

In order to function as priest or preacher, in church or other religious society, the person in question must take an oath which reads: "I will support the government with every means in my power." Since the bishops realized that a segment of the priests would be accepting government pay they consented, approving the oath with the following proviso: Insofar as it would not conflict with God's rights and Church rights. The bishops themselves declined to accept State pay.

How about religious instruction in Czecho-Slovakia? As such, it is not forbidden. It may only be given to those children, however, whose fathers have submitted a written request for it to the school principal. Again the scare tactic is used, since the authorities know that many a parent will refrain from submitting such a petition lest pressure be exerted on him by Party functionaries, threatening loss of job or the like. A second type of scare tactic is the fact that often the very persons selected to give the religious instruction are in reality loyal Communists. With the State reserving the right to say who can or cannot be priests and ministers of the gospel, it will naturally choose for instruction in religious doctrine such clergymen who are willing to compromise. Another facet of the intimidation tactic is the placing in the path of those who remain loyal to their religious upbringing obstacles to their higher education. The family attitude itself is important in moulding the attitude of the child, and strong religious families are naturally considered a block to the spreading of Communist ideas.

Once the Reds succeeded in liquidating the "unteachables," those who refused to follow the Party line, the remaining ministers and priests had three paths to choose from: (1) They could become ideological and practical collaborators with Communism, the road traveled by Ján Plojvár, a Catholic priest who, it is said, never wanted to be a priest in the first place, or Josef Hromádka, a Lutheran minister and Vice-President of the World Council of Reformed Churches(2). Like Archbishop Beran, having learned that compromise cannot work, this group have become members of a resistance movement, (3) are those who have fallen in line with the masses and when in Rome, do as the Romans do.

Down through history persecutions have led to a deepening of religious life. In Czecho-Slovakia the government has had little success with its efforts to promote a substitute for religious activity in the form of youth initiation ceremonies, name-giving and the like. Perhaps an old Czech adage is again proving to be right: "When the spirit is drunk, God is forgotten. Only when trouble comes do we really learn to know Him."

• • •

## NEW STRICTURES ON BENEŠ

Karl Kern

Even outside Sudeten German circles Edward Beneš' political genius is gradually being recognized for the mere legend that it was. Czech historians, too, are beginning to contribute to the truth. Josef Korbel's report "**The Communist Subversion of Czechoslovakia 1938-1945**" is additional proof to that effect. The book has received much publicity. Malmö's leading Swedish newspaper **Arbetet** has published a lengthy review of it. The **Neue Zürcher Zeitung** takes ponderous stock of some of the mistakes made by Beneš, "that shrewd diplomat," at a time when judicious people clearly foresaw "where friendship with Moscow would lead him and his country."

The review in **Arbetet** was written by the young Finn Jörn Donner. The author who spent some weeks in Prague

in spring 1959, where he rubbed elbows with the population, was able to draw on personal observations. In evaluating the latest phase of Czech history, however, he does not rely solely on Czech sources. Being familiar, too, with Wenzel Jaksch's **"Europe's Road to Potsdam,"** Donner knows that in 1948 the Communists merely gave the finishing touch to the Czech tragedy. It was initiated by the utterly short-sighted policy of the "shrewd diplomat" and is rooted in the events of 1918, namely, the Peace Treaty of Saint Germain.

This self-evident fact has long been recognized by observers genuinely conversant with Central European history. However, when historians living on the outskirts of the continent presently penetrate to the heart of the matter, such elucidation must be considered well-nigh sensational, particularly in light of Beneš' hitherto spotless reputation in Scandinavia. Beneš has been regarded — and still is throughout Norway and Denmark — as the upright standard-bearer of European democracy until he was tricked by the contemptible Sudeten Germans and then by the vicious Communists. Though his policy is not usually examined, his fate is still deplored.

Anyone who wants objectively to analyze recent Czech or Slovak history must study Jaksch's book. Unfortunately, when it comes to deflating the Beneš legend, many historians silently circumvent certain significant events in Czech history. Jörn Donner is no exception in that respect. Yet the fact is, that Czecho-Slovakia was beyond salvage in 1948. The middle class and social democratic parties still in existence at that time were simply not equal to the task. Even had they possessed greater capability, they could not have stemmed the tide. True, the mistakes made in 1948 were of a tactical nature. But no tactics, however clever, could have undone the basic failure of Beneš in the wake of his trip to Moscow in May 1943 and even earlier.

It is well-known that the trip resulted in the Czech-Soviet alliance and in Moscow's approval to expropriate and drive out the 3,500,000 Sudeten German citizens of Czecho-Slovakia. In 1919 at the Peace Conference of Saint Germain these citizens had been "allocated" to the ČSR against their

wish; the right of self-determination, demanded by Beneš and Masaryk for their own people, had rashly been refused the Sudeten Germans. Notwithstanding superficial assertions to the contrary, the truth is that during no phase of soi-disant Czecho-Slovak history did the majority of the Sudeten Germans aspire to "return home to the Reich"; they wanted self-administration, that natural right, held inalienable today even by the most primitive tribes in Africa or Asia, (except for the Communist-dominated areas, where such right is definitely tabu). However, the decisive conclusion is that Beneš' politics quite logically had to terminate in Moscow's claws. Quite logically, for the 1918 establishment of the first Czech republic and its subsequent collapse (lies and deception being no stable foundation) were sponsored by, and were the inevitable outcome of that same Macchiavellism which later became Beneš' ultimate wisdom. His pact with the Beelzebub of Moscow was therefore only a step consistent with his design for power to square accounts with the Devil of Sudeten Germandom "once and for all."

The expulsion of 3,500,000 people from their ancient homeland, the brutal robbery perpetrated on all these unfortunates, was the final collapse of what had been left of Czech democracy. A state based upon deceit and intrigue, above all, on a denial to three and one-half million of its citizens of the right of self-determination and self-administration, could not possibly be saved by means of robbery, without undermining the foundation of Czech liberty itself.

• • •

#### WHO SAID IT?

"At this fateful time, when the Red Army and the armies of the United States and other United Nations are fighting on German soil, we can look forward with even greater confidence to the early defeat of the Nazi aggressors and the attainment of our common goal — a durable and just peace and a continuance of close collaboration between all the United Nations." — F. D. Roosevelt's cablegram, Nov. 6, 1944, to the Soviet President on the occasion of the 27th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

## CONTEMPORARY TENDENCIES IN SLOVAK PHILOLOGY

Joseph M. Kirschbaum, LL.D., Ph.D.

A reprint from **SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES**  
Vol. IV, Part 3-4, Published by the University of Montreal,  
Department of Slavic Studies.

A bibliographic review of Slovak linguistics and philology show that, in the last twenty years, philology in Slovakia has experienced an all round development and progress and is developing, both quantitatively and qualitatively, comparatively undisturbed, even since the inclusion of Slovakia into the Soviet cultural and political sphere of influence.

A complete picture of the contemporary state of Slovak philology would require, of course, thorough research not only into the development of philology in Slovakia, which is exposed to Russian and Czech cultural influences, but also into that of the countries of the free world, where a comparatively large number of cultural and scientific workers use the Slovak language. For both linguist and philologist such a research project would be interesting not only because in scores of Slovak periodicals and books, which are published in the free world, there are traces of the influence of the Romance and the Anglo-Saxon languages, particularly in the syntax, but a research would be of interest also because in the free world, there were published several philological studies in which two tendencies are quite evident. The first tendency rejects orthographic changes in the Slovak language; the second, representing the majority of cultural workers, at the recommendation of the leading Slovak philologist, Professor Henry Bartek, accepted in principle the orthographic changes which were instituted by the philologists in Slovakia from the time of the Czecho-Russian occupation.

However, the framework of this study is limited to research into the Soviet orbit and, therefore, we forego at this time, a research into the development of Slovak philology in the countries of the free world, even though some works of H. Bartek, Philip Hrobak, Joseph Konuš, and others,

warrant the attention of a wider circle of Slavists. The following outline of the contemporary state of Slovak philology concerns itself only with the development in Slovakia.

### **Sovietophil Tendencies and Their Extent**

As with literature and science, in general, philology, too, has been exposed, since the inclusion of Slovakia into the Soviet sphere of influence, to political pressure by the Communist Party and is, therefore, gradually developing with considerable dependence on Soviet philology. This occurs particularly through the influence of some cultural workers who were elevated by the present regime to positions of importance in Slovak cultural life because of their partisan adherence rather than their past scientific performances or professional qualifications. These "cultural commissioners" from the very beginning tried to adapt to Slovak philology "the theoretical directives which were given Marxist philology by J. V. Stalin in his genial works **Marxism and Problems of Linguistics and Economic Problems of Socialism in the U. S. S. R.**(1). However, a considerable number of true philologists adhered, in the first place, to scientific principles.

The barefaced efforts to align Slovak philology with "the Marxist directives" and subjugate it to the contemporary political regime come to light particularly in the introduction to the new **Rules of Slovak Orthography** (*Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu*), published in 1953. The editor-in-Chief, Dr. Štefan Peciar, and the majority of the members of the commission which prepared the **Rules**, received their education and matured scientifically either in the bourgeois Czecho-Slovak Republic or between 1939-1945 in the Slovak Republic, but in the introduction to their work, which otherwise "in substance did not change the present orthography and its basic principle," according to their own admission, they deemed it necessary to pay homage to Stalin and to attack the philologists who prepared the **Rules** of orthography in 1940.

It would certainly be quite superfluous to try to prove that Marxism belongs to the sphere of political and social sciences, and that serious scholars know as yet neither "the



Marxist philology," nor the Marxist scientific method or principle in linguistics and philology, but only the political and unscientific interference by the regimes which subscribe to the Marx-Engels' or Lenin's political and economic theories. In the same manner, philology does not recognize fascist principles in philology and linguistics, which principles some of the contemporary linguists in Slovakia are attempting to discover in the works of their predecessors or contemporaries living in the countries of the free world. Needless to say that they are attempting to discover such "fascist" principles not on the basis of scholarly research, but in an effort to perform a service for the present political regime.

There are, therefore, no serious suppositions in Slovakia that some "Marxist point of view" even if such a thing existed, could already have asserted itself in Slovak philology. The review of names of the scholarly active philologists shows that they are the ones with whom we have been familiar, particularly during the period of the Slovak Republic. The bibliography of philology in Slovakia of the years 1939-47(2) serves as evidence that Dr. Peciar, as well as Dr. Paulíny, Jóna, Horecký, Ružička, and others, grew intellectually and created mainly during the existence of the Slovak Republic; and, that while some of them could have been reproached during the Second World War for trying to bring into Slovak philology the Czech philological theories (see the polemic Peciar-Uhlár in the periodical "Slovenská reč" (Slovak Language), there was no noticeable attempt at transferring the Russian philological theories. The generation educated under the present regime is still too young to make any serious contribution to scholarship or science, as the attainment of a university degree does not signify scientific qualification, but rather the confirmation of the ability to undertake scientific or scholarly work.

Therefore, we find predominating even in the **Bibliography of Slovak Philology for the Years 1948-1952**, compiled by Dr. Ladislav Dvonč, the names which became known during the previous period. Dvonč's bibliography is a sequel to Blanár's bibliography, and in its 1500 entries

it deals with: 1. all linguistic contributions published in Slovakia; 2. contributions by Slovak philologists and linguists in non-Slovak periodicals; and 3. contributions of non-Slovak authors on Slovak language or their philological works published in Slovakia.

Results of a favorable development of Slovak philology are visible in Dvonč's bibliography not only in the number of entries (1500 within four years), but also in the number of fields covered. Slovak philology is no more restricted to research into and perfection of the Slovak language alone. There is also a comparatively large number of works, studies, and articles on general linguistics, Indo-European languages, general Slavonic philology and linguistics, on artificial languages and on the organization of scholarly work in the field of philology and linguistics.

Soviet pressure or impact of Soviet philology appears particularly in the group "General philology" which contains 79 entries, mostly translations from Russian or works of Slovak lesser linguists on Soviet and Marxist philology and Stalin's theories. Only three of the known Slovak philologists (Peciar, Horecký and Jóna) take part in the Soviet attempt to impose "Marxist and Stalinist linguistic theories" upon Slovak philology. The most aggressive propagator of "Marxist philology," Alexander Isačenko, was brought up in Slovakia as a son of White Russian emigrés. He pays his debts now to Slovakia, which saved him and even gave him a university chair during the war, by serving Soviet aims as their most docile and obedient tool. (See his "Genial contributions to the theory of Marx-Leninism" — For a Marxist Philology" — "An important discussion on philology in the Soviet Union," etc.).

As for the Slovanic philology, it was dealt with in Slovakia, during the four years in question, in 229 entries. Slovak, and in translations foreign and other Slav scholars (Lehr-Splawinski, E. Knisza, Weingart, Dvozdec, Vinogradov, Pankevych, Barchudarov) covered the field of Old Church Slovanic, Russian, Polish, Czech, and other Slovanic languages. Among Slovak philologists, the most prolific and scholarly, according to the western standards,

appears to be prof. Ján Stanislav (Polish and Southern-Slav philology).

Scholarly research into the Slovak language is, of course, still the principal field of interest. The number of works, studies and articles, referring to the Slovak language, its history and development, is close to 700, many of them written by highly qualified philologists and linguists either of Slovak or foreign origin (J. Stanislav, L. Novák, E. Paulíny, V. Uhlár, A. Janošík, Š. Peciar, J. Horecký, V. Blanár, E. Jóna, Kniesza, Vážny, Kuraly, Stieber, etc.). They cover the history of literary languages in Slovakia, historical grammar and historical dialectology, etymology, phonology, orthography, vocabulary, grammar, etc.

### **Attack on Purism and Advocation of Slovanic Orientation**

The fact that Marxist methods are not considered seriously, even by the linguists who advocate them, is shown in the review of philological works published several years ago, as well as by the predominant condemnation of only those philologists who prepared the **Rules of Slovak Orthography**, in 1940. The older linguists, from Anthony Bernolák to Samuel Czambel, are highly esteemed; in fact, in certain instances, they are esteemed more highly than they were by the now proscribed philologists and literary historians of the period of the existence of the Slovak Republic(3). For example, in the introduction to the new **Rules**, we read the following:

"A significant role in the perfection of the Slovak language was played by our national awakeners. They discovered the internal criteria of the Slovak language, formulated then and laid strong foundations for our literary language and our lingual culture. Anton Bernolák took the first steps towards the stabilization of the Slovak literary language, its orthography, morphology, and vocabulary. For stabilizing the Slovak literary language in its present form, and particularly its morphology and orthography, Martin Hattala and Samo Czambel and others are mainly responsible."(4).

Among the classicists of Slovak literature, who "enriched, developed, and strengthened" the Slovak language, the "Marxist" commission also includes Ján Hollý who,

with Bernolák and Hattala, was also a Catholic priest and who (together with the above-mentioned) is credited with what even today is often reproachfully called "Slovak linguistic separatism" in English and French books, particularly if such books were inspired by Czech politicians or scholars.

The attack on the philologists who compiled the **Rules** of 1940 is obviously politically motivated. The servants of the present communist regime in Slovakia condemn the compilers of the previous **Rules**, first, because they were supposedly "the servants of **Ludák** (Populist) separatism and went out of their way to meet the demands of the treacherous politicians," and only in the second place, because "they strived to remove literary Slovak as far as possible from Czech and to isolate it also from other Slovanic languages." In other words, they were "puristically oriented" and marked the **Rules** with "a puristical tendency."

However, the changes which have been made in Slovak orthography, and the review of the philological studies of the past few years, do not testify to the fact that the present "Marxist" philologists have very substantially removed themselves from "the purists" or that they have approached closer to Czech or other Slovanic languages, with the exception of the Russian language. The entire evolutionary line of Slovak philology — the founders of which were the national awakeners of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who had to defend the Slovak language against Hungarian assimilatory tendencies and the nationalistically oriented linguists and philologists of the last decades of this century, for whom it was necessary to defend the Slovak language against no less dangerous Czech tendencies — has not yet been too remarkably dented by contemporary philologists in Slovakia. The thesis that the Slovak language tended to develop as a separate Slovanic language after the disappearance of the Old Slovanic language — and that the attempts to make it one of the dialects of the Czech language must only be considered as unscientific and political tendencies and aspirations — is practically proved by the scholarly works of the contemporary

philologists with all the weight and consistency of methods which cannot be labeled unscientific.

In harmony with the general cultural growth of the Slovak nation, Slovak philology develops in scope and depth. During 1939-1945 alone over a thousand works, treatises, articles, and studies in the field of philology were published. The linguists and philologists did not concern themselves merely with research into and the stabilization of the Slovak language, but also with the wider problems of linguistics and philology, Slovanic and non-Slovanic Indo-European languages, and with the general philology(5). During the war, there already was evident a promising development which was made in the formation of Slovak scientific and technical terminology, particularly in the scientific disciplines and in the technical-economic sphere of Slovak life(6). The contemporary philologists continue diligently in this "purism," and Slovak scientific and technical terminology has, in the past few years, been considerably enriched by the newly-coined or adapted terms of other Slovanic languages, particularly Russian.

Objectivity warrants the admission that the works of Slovak philologists are comparatively extensive; that the number of published books, studies and treatises in periodicals is considerable; and that the fields of scientific research are numerous. In the interest of truth, however, it is also necessary to add that this growth of scholarly works has no relation to, and is not to be credited to the contemporary political regime. Regardless of what regime might exist today in Slovakia, there would inevitably be more achievement in science, culture and arts than ever before. The explanation is to be found in the general development of Slovakia in the last forty years and particularly in the fact that, in the last years of the so-called bourgeois Czecho-Slovak Republic and especially during the period of the existence of the Slovak Republic, a large number of young Slovaks studied in universities at home and abroad, not only the traditional disciplines — theology, law, and medicine — but the entire field of science. The inclusion of Slovakia into the Soviet orbit befell them in the years of their scientific productivity or in their years of

university studies. If, today, in Slovakia, more is produced and published in philology or in other scientific fields, it is because the Slovak nation reached that stage of development at which there are found entire cadres of scientific and cultural workers. These cadres are so large that, even after the departure of thousands into exile, it is possible today to publish in Slovakia more books than ever before in all fields of science. The communist regime, in certain respects, by the limitation of freedom alone, holds back scientific work, and supports development only of those fields in which the political aims of the Communist Party can be pursued. Philology is, for the communist regime, a neutral rather than a privileged field.

As far as the linguistic side of the Slovak language is concerned, in the **Rules** as in other works, there appears a trend towards a more consistent use of the principles of phonetic orthography and towards the simplification of writing Slovak and foreign expressions. In philological production alone there are represented dialectology, lexicology, comparative philology, morphology, phonology, orthoepy, phonetics, etc. Several works deal with questions of the Cyrilo-Methodian period, the development of philology in other Slavonic nations (Russia, Bulgaria) and the history of the Slovak language. A scholarly level has been attained, first of all, by the works of older linguists and philologists, but the possession of the qualifications and preparation for the professional philological work is evident in a large number of younger intellectuals, particularly in their criticism, polemics and commentaries on the new editions of older literary or philological works (for instance, in the introductions to the new editions of the works of Bernolák, Hollý, Štúr, etc.).

### **End of the Controversy Regarding Literary Slovak and the Origin of the Slovak Language**

From the published works of philologists and literary historians it is also obvious that the Czech theses on the Slovak language, on the history of the Slovak literary language, and on the function of some foreign languages (Czech, Czechoslovak) in Slovak literature, which theses



were intended to support the political theses of a single Czechoslovak nation, have been definitely buried. In this respect, even some contemporary works of Czech philologists helped to support the scientific conclusions which have long been defended by Slovak philologists. Particularly noteworthy, on the Czech side is the work of Professor A. Dostal(7), and on the Slovak side, Paulíny's "**Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny**" — History of Literary Slovak, Bratislava, 1948(8), and Mráz's "**Dejiny slovenskej literatúry**" — History of Slovak Literature, Bratislava, 1948(9), as well as the papers read at the Moscow Fourth International Congress of Slavists in 1958. In this respect, particularly, the paper of Professor E. Paulíny on "**Bilingualism in the History of the Slovak Literary Language**," deserves special attention. Paulíny tries to explain the function of the Czech language in Slovakia in the 15th and following centuries on the basis of social and economic phenomena and changes. He has arrived, nevertheless, at the same conclusions as the philologists who did not apply "Marxist criteria" in philology, i.e., that the Czech language was a foreign language in Slovakia and could not stand competition with the Slovak vernacular when the Slovak ethnicum evolved in its national consciousness: though the Protestant minority, predominantly of Czech origin, tried to maintain it even in the 19th century when the Slovak literary language was established by the Catholic majority a whole century before that time. The relation between the Czech and Slovak is therefore, even according to Paulíny, that of bilingualism (p. 43).

A century-long controversy, as to whether Slovak is but a dialect of the Czech language, or a distinct Slavic tongue, has thus been "officially" closed by the recognition on both the Czech and Slovak sides that, from its earliest beginnings, the Slovak language has always manifested a distinct identity as a Slavic tongue of the inhabitants of Slovakia. By a careful analysis of the fundamental roots of both languages, Czech and Slovak, as well as through a comparative study of their later developments, contemporary scholars trained in philology have revealed the true basis of the Slovak language and have clas-

sified it properly as one of distinct Slavonic languages which developed after the disappearance of the Old Slavonic language.

The controversy was occasioned by two facts. On the one hand, some literary historians made no distinction between the language spoken by the Slovaks as their native tongue and their literary medium. The latter for some time was (besides Latin) the old Czech liturgical language. On the other hand, most of the philologists and literary historians, predominantly of Czech origin, in formulating purely scientific views as to the proper relationship between the Czech and Slovak languages, were influenced by political aspirations. Recent studies based on scientific principles of philology, phonology, etymology lexicography, and grammar now show that the original Slovak terminology, with rare exceptions, goes back to the original roots of a native Slovak language essentially distinct from every other Slavonic tongue.

The confusion created by the failure to draw a proper distinction between the native language of the Slovaks and their written or literary language was, however, only partly responsible for the erroneous view that Slovak was merely a dialect of the Czech language or that there was something like a "Czechoslovak language" (10). Theories on the existence of a "Czechoslovak language" were created even after one hundred years of the existence of the Slovak literary language which was accepted by both Slovak Catholics and Lutherans in 1844, and after two hundred years' use by the Catholics of their own vernacular as the literary medium around the University of Trnava, founded in 1635. Consequently, the main reason for the confusion was of a political nature, even if presented in "scientific" form. Professor F. Trávniček, for instance, used geography as his main argument for his theory of the "Czechoslovak language." The fact that the Czechs and Slovaks inhabited the present area from the sixth century was used by him as an argument that they had a common language. In his "**Historická mluvnice československá**" (Historic Czechoslovak Grammar) he stated: "The ancient Czechoslovak language lasted from the time of its inde-

pendent establishment as a full-fledged language, from the sixth to the end of the tenth century, and is similar to the prehistoric tongue. The chief condition of this independent development was that our ancestors were separated geographically from the rest of the Slavs"(11).

Geographical factors can hardly take precedence over linguistic data, and even if we accept this theory, another factor, the separation of Czechs and Slovaks from the ninth century, would be in favor of an independent development of the Slovak spoken tongue. Slovak philologists and linguists — Czambel, Škultéty, Bartek, Stanislav, Novák, etc.(12) — rejected, therefore the Czech theories and looked for linguistic criteria to determine the origin and the main characteristics of the Slovak language. They reviewed the historic forms of the Slovak tongue and, by linguistic methods of phonology as well as by a comparative study, they arrived at new conclusions as to the origin and development of the Slovak language. These conclusions were ultimately accepted by contemporary Czech as well as other Slavic philologists and linguists(13).

As a result of this development the relation between the two literary languages of today's Czecho-Slovakia is now officially accepted as a relation between two Slavic but distinct languages. Czech poetry and prose are translated into the Slovak, and vice versa, as the Polish or Russian have always been. Life and historical facts prevailed over artificial tendencies and theories a long time ago, and finally they have prevailed even over the reluctance of some politicians and philologists to recognize the irrefutable.

## REFERENCES

(1) **Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu**, Bratislava, Slovenská akadémia vied, 1953, p. 7.

(2) Dr. Vincent Blanár: **Bibliografia jazykovedy na Slovensku v rokoch 1939–1947**, Bratislava, Slovenská akadémia vied a umení, 1950, p. 210. This work contains 1117 titles, of which approximately 1000 were published during the existence of the Slovak Republic. Altogether Blanár presents an almost complete picture of linguistic and philological works, published in book form or in periodicals, in the fields of general philology, comparative linguistics of Indo-European languages, Slavic philology and the study of the Slovak language. See also Dr. L. Dvonč: **Bibliografia slovenskej jazykovedy za roky 1948–1952**, Matica Slovenská, 1957.

(3) See, for example, the evaluation of L. Štúr as a philologist in the book "**Ludovít Štúr, Slovenčina**" naša," which was prepared and annotated by Dr. J. Ambruš and has been evaluated linguistically by Dr. V. Blanár. According to Blanár, Štúr kept pace with the European philological schools of that time and its foremost phenomena, and his studies at Halle predestined him to become, in Slavonic and Slovak circumstances, one of the first representatives of the newest methods on theories in philology.

(4) **Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu**, p. 6. — Anton Bernolák (1762–1813) codified the Slovak literary language as used by the Slovak Catholics from the time of the counter-Reformation and especially since 1635, the year of the foundation of the second university in Slovakia, at Trnava. Bernolák gave a solid foundation to the Slovak literary language, based on the Western Slovak dialect, in his works: *Dissertatio philologico-critica de litteris Slavorum: Linguae slavonicae per Regnum Hungariae usitatae compendiosa simul at facilis orthographia* (Bratislava, 1737); *"Grammatica slavica"* (1790), and in his huge pentalingual dictionary, published after his death, in 1825.

Martin Hattala (1821–1903), who later became a professor at the University of Prague, codified the reform introduced by L. Štúr, which was accepted in 1844 by both Slovak Catholics and Protestants. His *"Krátka mluvnica slovenská"* (Short Slovak Grammar), published in 1852, gave a scientific basis and form to Štúr's reform.

Samuel Czambel (1856–1909), one of the greatest Slovak philologists, enriched Slovak philology by several scholarly works regarding dialectology, morphology, and lexicology. His main works are *"Slovenský pravopis"* (Slovak Orthography, 1890) and *"Rukoväť spisovnej reči slovenskej"* (Manual of the Slovak Literary Language, 1902). For details concerning Bernolák, Hattala, and Czambel, see Prof. E. Paulíny: *"Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny."*

(5) Compare V. Blanár: **Bibliografia**.

(6) Pioneer and valuable work in this direction was done particularly by Professor Dr. Julius Ledenyi-Ladziánsky in the terminology of medical science.

(7) Prof. Dr. A. Dostal: **Nástin dejín českého a slovenského jazyka**, Prague, Štátní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1954.

(8) Prof. Dr. Eugen Paulíny: **Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny**, Bratislava, Slovenská akadémia vied a umení, 1948. In the introduction to his book, Paulíny understands the history of the language as the history of the origin, disappearance and changes of its individual styles. However, in the book itself, he divided the history of the Slovak literary language according to the languages which were used by the Slovaks as literary languages in addition to the spoken vernacular from the time of the Greater Moravia. On page 5, he writes: "Although, in this case, the period of the actual Slovak literary language can begin only with Bernolák, or with the period shortly before Bernolák, nevertheless it is not possible to begin the history of the literary languages of the Slovaks either with Bernolák or Štúr, but it is necessary to go deep into the past, all the way to the very beginnings of the historical period of our nation in the Greater Moravian epoch, nay, in certain matters, it is necessary to go even

further, into the pre-historic period, when our ancestors were not yet baptized and did not participate in the European culture which was introduced to us by Christianity."

(9) Prof. A. Mráz: **Dejiny slovenskej literatúry**, Bratislava, Slovenská akadémia vied a umení, 1948.

(11) F. Trávníček: **Historická mluvnice československá**, Brno, 1935, p. 21-23.

(10) This thesis was propagated by Dr. Eduard Beneš through his publication **Détruisez l'Autriche**, Paris, 1916, and, with the help of Czech philologists, it penetrated also into many western university circles and was repeated by the Slavists on this continent as well.

(13) Besides authors of Slovak origin (Hrobák, Konuš, Potoček, and others), the correct attitude towards the Slovak language, in the English language works, was taken particularly by Professor Alfred Senn in the symposium **A Handbook of Slavic Studies**, edited by L. I. Strakhovsky, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1949.

(12) Professor Bartek published, both in Slovakia and in exile, a number of philological works, some of which were published in French and English. Blanár's "**Bibliografia**" cites thirteen titles of his works. The best known philologists, besides Bartek, are Stanislav and Novák. Stanislav is known particularly for his research into the Cyrilo-Methodian period and for his works in toponymy. Novák was silenced by the communist regime; Stanislav is still active. Bartek performed a very meritorious service, particularly by founding the periodical "**Slovenská reč**" (Slovak Language), and by his uncompromising stand in the so-called "matičné" (Slovak Institute) struggles for the purity of the Slovak language and its separate development since the disappearance of the Old Slavonic language.

• • •

#### WHO SAID IT?

"President Benes was always of the opinion, and in his latest statements always stressed, that our pact of alliance with Soviet Russia and our friendship with other Slav nations must not encroach on our friendly and cordial relations with other democratic states. This is the natural desire, shared by an enormous majority of our people, and nothing prevents us from keeping the confidence of the democratic states and strengthening and deepening our friendship with our great western Allies. Moscow, too, wants to follow this line of policy. It will, however, be necessary for certain prejudices of the West with regard to the Soviet Union, which are still existing, to be swept away." — **Premier Fierlinger** of Czecho-Slovakia, OWI Bulletin, June 1, 1945.

## LET'S PUT SLOVAK IN THE CURRICULUM

The early Slovaks in America — of sturdy peasant stock — were individualists. They wanted to have their own homes, their own churches and schools, fraternal benefit societies, newspapers, civic, social, and cultural institutions. For the most part, these were the things they could not have in the own homeland, Slovakia, which was then a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. They were then, as they are now strictly SLOVAK, not CZECHO-SLOVAK ( with or without hyphen) — enterprises. And the Slovaks in America did organize and build the things they wanted. Today in America, there are some 370 Slovak churches, 240 parochial and Sunday schools, a dozen fraternal, 20 newspapers and periodicals, and many Slovak cultural, civic, and social societies.

It did not take the Slovak pioneers in America long to learn enough English to get along and to adapt themselves to their new environment. The American way of life appealed to them. In fact, compared to life "back home," life in America — with all its initial hardships — was a thousand times better. In America a man was free!

The Slovaks built their own churches and schools to enhance their own cultural level and to preserve their Slovak heritage in the "new homeland" — their language and their religious and national traditions. There it was that the oldsters were taught English and the youngsters Slovak. Father Stephen Furdek, known as the "Apostle of American Slovaks," provided the text books. In time the Slovaks of America had — and still have — everything needed to perform the mission for which their institutions were established. They kept the faith of their fathers, but as the years rolled by the Slovaks broke away to a great extent from the past, the ideals of their forefathers, as far as preserving the Slovak language and national customs was concerned. It is unfortunate that this has come to pass. And more so that it happened within two generations removed from Father Furdek (he died in 1915) and the Slovak pioneers. Whether the trend will continue depends for the most part on the administrators



of these Slovak institutions. All is not yet lost: the churches and schools built by the Slovaks in America are still with us. They can still be used to enhance and preserve the heritage of the Slovaks and to the advantage our America.

Of course, we can expect the same old question to pop up in places: "But why teach Slovak?" Teach it for the same reasons that so many other seemingly "impractical" subjects are taught in our primary and secondary schools. No one can foresee with any great degree of accuracy just what any child will be able to use later on in life. And so it is with the Slovak language, too. Besides the sentimental reason for offering children Slovak in Slovak parochial schools, there are practical reasons also. These were brought to the fore recently by our Government and by eminent educators, including members of the American Catholic Hierarchy.

His Excellency, Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh, early in the year called upon Americans to understand the languages of other peoples of the world as a prelude to understanding the peoples themselves. He was then Bishop of the Worcester Diocese.

Speaking at Assumption College, Bishop Wright said that "perhaps the greatest embarrassment for Americans abroad is that we can't understand and talk with other peoples unless they are willing to learn our language."

Citing a statement from St. Augustine that "a man is more at home with his dog than he is with another man whose language he cannot understand," Bishop Wright commented that "in the presence of a man whose language we cannot speak, we are almost fatally and mutually antagonistic."

"Hence," Bishop Wright said, "it is tremendously important that our children be taught languages — that in language they may find the genius of people, since it is in language that people express ideas."

"Thus we may come to a greater understanding of other people and a mutual sympathy with them, so that eventually man may become as at home with other men as with his dog," Bishop Wright concluded.

Bob Considine, syndicated columnist, also speaking at the Worcester, Mass., school, stated: "We can't go into foreign countries any longer as the arrogant conquerer. We must go as friends and equals, not as superiors, not trying to lord it over them. Yet in a way we do lord it over them by not knowing their languages and by being contemptuous of their customs."

Elementary school teachers and administrators, attending the 56th annual convention of the National Catholic Educational Association in Atlantic City (March 30 to April 3, 1959) discussed the usefulness and feasibility of teaching foreign languages in the elementary schools. Sister Mary Helen of the department of modern languages of St. Teresa College, Winona, Minn., spoke on the "Preparation of Elementary School Teachers for the Foreign Language Program." Sister Raymond de Jesus, assistant dean of the Diocesan Teachers College, Putnam, Conn., discussed "Materials and Methods for the Foreign Language Program in the Elementary School." Father Frederick A. McGuire, C. M., executive secretary of the Mission Secretariat, a clearing house of information for overseas missionary societies, addressed the group on "Foreign Languages in the Elementary School — Their Significance for the World Mission of the Catholic Church."

In World War II, we found out just how badly we had neglected the teaching of foreign languages. Our armies were scattered throughout the world. Communication had to be carried on through interpreters who had been hurriedly and, therefore, inadequately trained in foreign languages. The situation has been remedied to a certain extent, but there still is a very great need of language experts in all departments of U. S. Government, particularly in the Foreign Service Department and the United States Information Agency. It is obvious that it is far better to have people in service with a thorough understanding of the historical background of a certain people than people only with a linguistic knowledge.

Only a year and half ago, a survey disclosed that more than half of our government's diplomats did not have a speaking knowledge of the language of the countries

to which they were sent (THE NEW YORK TIMES, Nov. 18, 1959). Dr. Harold Hoskins, director of the Foreign Service Institute, now reports that all members of the Foreign Service have taken mandatory tests in foreign languages since the alarming survey was published. A special foreign language school was established in Arlington, Va., by the State Department. Congress made more funds available for language training in the present fiscal year than it did for all kinds of training four years ago. As a result, the training school in Arlington is perhaps one of the most efficient in the nation. Sixteen specialists make up the faculty for the teaching of foreign languages, while ninety-nine instructors teach in their native tongues, with little or no English spoken during instruction periods.

"The problem now," Dr. Hoskins says, "is to develop specialists in the critical though less widely used, languages and dialects of many parts of Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Africa."

Interesting it is to note that Dr. Hoskins' report lists 11 Foreign Service officers who are now available "with a working knowledge, or higher proficiency," in SLOVAK. Furthermore, the director of the Foreign Service Institute estimates that the State Department will have 85 to 90 per cent of its officers reach "professional proficiency" in at least one foreign language by 1962.

The stress today is particularly on Russian for obvious reasons. Academic Russian is being introduced into more public schools every year. Other Slavic languages may be neglected, because, some authorities say, they don't mean as much as the Russian language. What they really mean is that they know little about Russian and even less about the other Slavic (Slavic) languages. Even in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the stress is on Russian, though we know, for example, that over one-third of all the Slovaks in America are settled there (there are about two million Americans of Slovak descent in the USA). And the stress is on Russian and Russian only, even though Slovak, in my considered opinion, is the key language to all Slavic languages. I have recommended (to the Army Language School in Monterey, Calif., for

example) — and still recommend — at least one semester of Slovak for students of any Slavic language. It makes the study of the other Slavic languages more facile, since it contains elements common to all the Slavic languages, elements that are not found in the others. It is true that the various Slavic languages have an even greater affinity than do other related language groups, but I earnestly suggest a serious consideration of non-Russian Slavic language background as a valuable and practical basis for the study of academic Russian.

Over a generation ago, Carl W. Hasek (**Higher Education Circular** No. 23, U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, 1920) urged a greater awareness of the practical need for a wider study of the Slovanic (Slavic) languages and cultures in our schools, citing various reasons, esthetic and practical, pertinent to this matter. The esthetic consideration — the direct enjoyment of, for example, the rich Russian literature — is as valid now as it was then, while the practical reasons have taken on even greater urgency.

Mrs. Elizabeth Peters, writing in the **PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL JOURNAL** (October, 1958), considered the question of the most likely source of Russian language candidates in the public schools of the Commonwealth. She said:

“Census statistics reveal that conservatively estimated there are fifty to one hundred thousand pupils of Slavic heritage in the schools of Pennsylvania. It is generally accepted among leaders in the groups that there is a three-generation span in which these groups, with their rich folklore and their frequently devout religious affiliation, have tended to keep their traditions, culture, and language alive by means of family, church, and fraternal activities.”

Mrs. Peters is correct; census statistics, as quoted, are very conservative. The fourth generation is with us and the traditions of the Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, Poles, Slovenians, and Russians — plus those of other non-English groups — are still in evidence. And they will be for some time to come.

Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York have a goodly number of Slovak residents, that is, citizens whose ethnic background is Slovak. The study of Slovak — for itself and as a preparation for the study of other Slavonic languages — should be given serious consideration by our educators. And Slovak parochial schools should place the study of Slovak on their curriculums. We suggest that the children be taught at least four years (5-8 grades), though the study can be offered earlier. Books are available. And teachers would have little difficulty in learning and presenting the subject. Interested? Write to: Philip A. Hrobak, Jednota Printery, Middletown, Pa.

• • •

### Castles of Slovakia:

#### ČAČTICE

By Hubert Macko, O.S.B.

We know that the history of Castle Čachtice begins with the 14th century because in a document, dated in 1319, there is mention of a certain Thomas Rufus as the administrator of Čachtice.

In the year 1392, King Zigmund gave the fortress to Ctibor "for faithful and generous services rendered." What these services were we do not know, but we suppose they were of a military nature. The same document states that if Ctibor should die without children, the fortress automatically is to be inherited by his two brothers, Nicholas and Andrew. In the same document it was stated that the fortress must be sold only to a fellow countryman, never to a stranger.

Ctibor died in 1414, and the fortress was inherited by his son, Ctibor II, who was at that time high-commissioner of Nitra. In 1430 Ctibor II was a captain in the army of King Zigmund which fought against the Czech Hussites. He died rather suddenly shortly after, and, not leaving a male descendant, the fortress was claimed by King Zigmund. Ctibor's daughter, Kathryn, inherited the fortress Beckov.

In 1436, King Zigmund gave Čachtice to the provincial treasurer, Michael Orságh, whose family held the fortress until 1567. The last of the Orsághs was Christopher. During this period the Hussite leader Švehla was a prisoner in the fortress; he was later put to death in Kostelany.

In 1569 King Maximilian rented the fortress for 50,000 Gold crowns to Ursula Kanižaj and her son Francis Nádasdy, with the stipulation that in case the fortress would be put up for sale, Francis Nádasdy would have first option to buy.

In the year 1602, Nádasdy did buy the fortress from king Rudolph II. Nádasdy was the unfortunate husband of the infamous Alžbeta (Elizabeth) Báthorička. The story of Alžbeta Báthorička, sordid in every detail, is nevertheless true. It begins on a morning of a beautiful day in May. Alžbeta had many servants, girl servants, who took care of her every whim. She was a proud and haughty woman, but not beautiful. A young girl servant, combing her mistress's hair, accidentally pulled out a small tuft. Alžbeta became infuriated and struck the girl across the mouth, drawing blood. Few drops of the young girl's blood happened to fall on the uplifted face of the cruel mistress. Looking into the mirror, she imagined that where the drops of blood fell, the skin seemed much smoother and more youthful. Suddenly an insane idea began to germinate in her mind: if the drops of blood did make her skin smoother and younger looking, why not enhance her beauty, by bathing in the blood of young girls? It could be that the blood of young maidens was the long sought for fountain of youth, she thought, and the more she thought about it, the stronger her determination became to use the blood bath. She needed accomplices, but it was not difficult to enlist the services of some of her servants for a considerable grant of money and special privileges.

#### BLOOD OF 600 SLOVAK GIRLS

The servants went out into the neighboring villages and towns and by means fair and foul, by promises and intimidations, brought many young girls to the Castle. The girls were treated very nicely for a time, and then mur-



dered in the most cruel manner, their blood supplying the "fountain of youth" for the ghoulish mistress. It is said that some 600 young girls were murdered by the mistress of Čachtice.

Of course the disappearance of these girls could not be kept secret forever. Rumors began to circulate, but Báthorička was a mighty lady. She was mistress not only of many thousand acres of land, but mistress of many thousands of lives. She had the power of life or death over her underlings. And so the people under her dared not express in words the fears that were in their hearts. They suffered mutely, seeing their daughters disappear one by one. Báthorička had powerful connections; she was a favorite friend of the Palatine, being invited to the marriage feast of his daughter, Judith. The feast lasted for a whole year.

But there was one person who did not fear the infamous woman. He was the parish priest of Čachtice. After obtaining all the proof he could, he set out for Bratislava, where the court was then in session. The priest had little success at that time, but in the year 1610 the Palatine George Thurzo, due to pressure of public opinion, decided to investigate. With two nephews of Báthorička, Zrinský and Drugeth respectively, he set out for the fortress, where he learned the bitter truth. Entering the fortress unheralded, he caught Báthorička in the act of killing two young maidens. He found other corpses on a manure pile outside the fortress. He ordered the seizure of the castle and put Alžbeta in a dungeon together with her helpers John Ficko-Ujváry, Helen Jó, Kathryn Benicka, and Dorothy Szentes. These last were taken to the Palatine's Castle and condemned to death.

On January 7, 1611, the court in Bytča handed down this decree: "We, Theodosius Strmsky of Sul'ov, the highest magistrate of his Majesty the King, Gašpar Orodoy of Trenčín, John David of St. Peter, George Lehotský, Nicholas Hrabovský, John Záturecký, John Boršický, Gabriel Hlinický, Michael Tušinský, Raphael Kašovský, Benedict Kožar, Stephen Marššovský, Stephen Akay, John

Medvecký, all members of this august court, make public to all whom it may concern that we were called together by the Palatine George Thurzo to the city of Bytča this day, January 7, in the year 1611, to sit in judgment over the deeds of John Ficko and the women Helen, Kathryn, and Dorothy, and found the following to be true:

Whereas it is known that Palatine George Thurzo has been constituted to guard the persons and the property of those under his care as Palatine of the county of Orava, to punish the guilty and reward the deserving, and wishing to do his duty, he could not be deaf and blind to the deeds of one Alžbeta Báthorička, the widow of Francis Nádasdy, who was an honorable man, deserving much from his country, but whose widow committed deeds of tyranny unheard of since the birth of mankind, having done away with innumerable young girls for the purpose of bathing in their blood, he, therefore, caused an investigation to be made of the deeds of one Alžbeta Báthorička, the investigation based on evidence presented against her by the townspeople. The truth of the accusations were subsequently substantiated by her own servants, accomplices in her many crimes.

Hearing of the cruelties, supposedly committed in the Čachtice Castle; His Highness, Palatine George Thurzo, returning from celebrations in Prešporok (now Bratislava) in company of the two nephews of Alžbeta Báthorička, Nicholas Zrinský and Juraj Drugeth, and a large following of friends and soldiers, unexpectedly visited Čachtice, and at the very entrance to the Castle was confronted by mute evidence in the form of the mutilated bodies of two young girls, proving beyond the shadow of doubt that the rumors about Čachtice were true. Alžbeta Báthorička was immediately sentenced to life imprisonment in her own Castle. John Ficko, Helen, Dorothy, and Kathryn were ordered to be tried elsewhere, and if proven guilty, to be given sentences commensurate with the hideousness of their crimes so that others may be deterred from committing the same.

The accused confessed, particularly Dorothy, who was

the chief offender next to her mistress, that they took part in the awful deaths of innocent young girls. The court, finding them guilty imposed the following sentences: Dorothy and Helen shall have their fingers pulled off their hands with burning pincers, then be burned at the stake. John Ficko, who took a minor part in the bloody orgies and on account of his advanced age, shall not be tortured, but shall be beheaded and his body burned at the stake. And since Dorothy and Helen pleaded for Kathryn, and only John Ficko witnessed against her, she shall be put into prison until such time as her innocence or guilt shall be proven beyond a possible doubt. These sentences to be carried out immediately."

Alžbeta Báthorička was not tried publicly. She was sentenced by George Thurzo to life imprisonment in the dungeons of the Čachtice castle where she died in the year 1614. After her death, the fortress was inherited by her two children, Paul Nádasdy and Kathryn, who was married to Ján Drugeth. A third child, Anna, wife of Nicholas Zrinský inherited nothing. Paul Nádasdy received the title of Count in the year 1625. After the death of Paul and Anna Nádasdy, the fortress became the property of the many heirs. In the year 1703, the fortress was the property of Count Paul Forgáč. In 1707, for reasons not given, the fortress was besieged by the army of the king and taken. The following year it was wrested from the king by the followers of Francis Rákóczi II. The fortress commanded a beautiful view of the Považie and Zahorie area. Hrad Čachtice is classed among the larger fortresses of Slovakia; it had two large towers and three courts. It has been uninhabitable since the beginning of the 18th century.

The people of the vicinity give the old ruins a wide berth. They are superstitious and will bless themselves when passing the ruins. They will tell you that if you listen on a summer's evening, just before a storm, you will hear the wailings of the young maidens who were sacrificed to a woman's vanity. They whisper a prayer for them and utter a curse for Alžbeta Báthorička.

## COMMUNIST TACTICAL "FLEXIBILITY"

Dr. Fraňo Tiso

Die-hard coexistentialists in the western world repeatedly call for "Flexibility" in political negotiations with Moscow. Among their number are those who in their naiveté sincerely believe it possible, by applying a flexible method of negotiation, to bring about a relaxation of tension between East and West. Among them are also masked Communists who, by the aid of "flexibility," seek to effect a more rapid capitulation of the West. Oddly enough not one of the two types of coexistentialists has so far given a concrete example as to just how the West should practice this flexibility with respect to the East. Hence it may be interesting to demonstrate "flexibility" as the Communists practice it.

Communist tactics operate primarily by "mental reservation." I experienced the first typical case of such tactics in Moscow. During the early summer of 1940, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Molotov, presented Rumanian Consul Davidescu an ultimatum in which Rumania was asked to evacuate and immediately turn over Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. After delivering the ultimatum Comrade Molotov consoled the painfully perplexed consul with the following words: "And when you have carried out our demand, the Soviet Union will no longer interfere in Rumania's domestic affairs."

This generous promise was an easy one for Molotov to make. It was not even necessary for the Soviet Union to interfere **directly** in Rumanian domestic affairs since the Rumanian Communist Party — on order of Moscow — could do so anyway whenever it liked.

Stalin, for example, was frequently asked in writing, mostly by American journalists, such questions as: "Do you believe that the two divergent political, economic and social systems can satisfactorily live side by side?" Stalin's answer was always: "I believe it." At no time, however, has the question been asked: "How long will you continue to believe it?"

During the Magyar popular revolt in 1956, an agree-

ment was made between Premier Nagy and the Commander-in-Chief of Soviet troops, according to which Soviet forces would move out of Hungary at a certain border point. Premier Nagy, himself a Communist and Communist-educated, failed to have it included in the agreement that **other** Soviet troops would **not enter** Hungary via a **different** border point. When, then, the units of the Soviet Army left Budapest only to call a halt some kilometers away, and when in consternation, Nagy inquired as to the cause for this halt, he was told the troops were merely being regrouped. The unhappy premier had forgotten to ask for what purpose this regrouping was being made.

Comrade Khrushchev declared in Peking, immediately after his visit to the United States, that it was wrong to want to force a people into the Communist camp against its will. That it was wrong "to test the stability of the capitalist system by force, since the peoples would never understand and back the person who mentally pursues such a tactic." Did Comrade Khrushchev, however, worry about being understood when he was brutally forcing peoples into the Communist sphere? Did he worry about the understanding of the Magyar people? Did he ever solicit the support of the enslaved peoples, among these his own Russian people?

"Flexibility" of tactics; tactic of "flexibility"! The Czech Communists behaved nobly indeed toward the autonomous movement of the Slovaks during the years from 1918 to 1938: they repeatedly emphasized in their news organs that the Slovaks, too, have a right to self-determination and they allowed for this to the day when the Slovaks were separated from Czecho-Slovakia.

In April, 1945, they forced Beneš to relinquish the national identity of Slovaks and Czechs, which he had so tenaciously insisted on up to that time, to proclaim the popular independence of the Slovaks and to guarantee to Slovakia the rights of a federal state (the Košice agreement" of April 1945). As part of the election propaganda of 1946, they presented to the Slovak voters a program which favored the restoration of Slovak independence. When, however, the elections were won not by the Com-

munists but by the middle class, the Communists began to steer an opposite course. In the new constitution of Czecho-Slovakia, presented to and accepted by the parliament upon the complete Communist seizure of power in February 1948, they permitted the Slovak provincial government to remain, but with severely curtailed authority. Czech Communists took over its important administrative departments and the leadership of the Slovak Communist Party. Slovak party leaders were either executed or sentenced to lengthy terms in the penitentiary. Others took their lives. Key positions in the party press were given to Czechs. Czechs also took over leading jobs in Slovak industry.

Inasmuch as these and similar dispositions on the part of Prague merely served to humble old Slovak Communists and reinforce their opposition to Prague, Comrade Antonín Novotný, first secretary of the Czech Communist Party and the country's president, caused a widespread centralization of the over-all state economic life and the drafting of a new "socialist" constitution. Centralization of the economy meant additional subordination of Slovak industry to Czech management. The new basic law, however, was to do away with the provincial or territorial government of Slovakia, which had become almost insignificant. This was truly a "flexibility" that led to the exact opposite of what was demanded so impressively thirty years ago.

Flexibility in the tactics of the West? Moscow was able to apply the flexibility, cited above in several examples, not only by dint of Communist morality which says that **that is moral which serves the Party**, but also for the reason that Communism has so far been on the offensive. The West, however, is still on the defensive. But a defensive stand, does not offer much of a chance or method of application, for to be "flexible" the West must also convert to a counter-offensive. To advise the vanguard country on the East-West front, the West German Federal Republic, to be flexible, while those who do the advising sit and play cards in bunkers that are not even expertly and reliably built, such is not the great art of war, and certainly it is not a form of protection.



## MASARYK'S ROLE IN CENTRAL EUROPE

F. O. Miksche

Before World War I, the interests of the Czech people were represented in the Vienna parliament by powerful political parties with a total of 107 mandates. The Agrarians had 29 seats! the Socialists 23; the so-called Young Czechs 20; the Catholics 17; the Radicals 10; the Conservatives 7; the so-called Progressives 1, which was held by T. G. Masaryk, spokesman for the entire Czech nation in England and other Allied countries during the First World War. His battle-cry "Destroy Austria" was by no means echoed by the other legally elected representatives, for in 1917 the Czech parties in the Vienna Assembly all proclaimed their loyalty to the Habsburg Dynasty. What Masaryk had to say about this subject is recorded in his memoirs: "Again and again we were told (in the Allied countries) that the Czech leaders at home were not in opposition to Austria, and the disavowals were soon forgotten. The Russian revolution and the entry of the United States into the war filled mens' minds. The refrain of my propaganda was 'Break up Austria'." Thus Masaryk's lonely voice, strengthened by Allied propaganda, became louder than the united voices of his 106 former colleagues in the Vienna Assembly.

The Czech politicians demanded the restoration of the Czech State, in federal association with the other countries of the Habsburg Crown. Their motives in doing so can certainly not be ascribed to any special love for the Dynasty, but to the necessity for ensuring the national existence and development of the Czech people. It was thought that if the Habsburg Monarchy were to fall, Bohemia would inevitably become a victim of German or Russian imperialism and lose its Home Rule. Palacký, famous Czech historian, who is always looked upon as the Father of the Czech nation, declared in 1848 that if Austria did not exist, it would have to be invented. All the radical slogans used for agitation could not hide the fact that the existence of all the small people of the Danubian Empire depended on it, and until the end of the First

World War Palacký's declaration remained a guide for Czech politicians. Some years earlier even Masaryk expressed the same view, as the following quotation from the program of his party, dated April 14, 1900, shows:

"We believe that the former sovereign independence of our Bohemian Lands is impossible today. Our small numbers, our geographical situation, and the fact that the Czech countries are also inhabited by Germans, have compelled us to unite with the other nations and lands." And what did young Beneš say in his French thesis for a doctorate, written at Dijon in 1908? The following is a quotation from his text: "People have often spoken of a dismemberment of Austria. I do not believe in it at all. The historical and political bonds between the different nations of the Empire are too powerful to make such dismemberment possible. . . . One cannot seriously think of the establishment of a Czech State if one-third of the inhabitants of the country (the Sudeten Germans) are determined to resist and will never accept it legally."

### Break With Tradition

Masaryk was the first Czech politician to break with the Palacký tradition, and is consequently often regarded as the betrayer of his testament. Did he perhaps imagine that after the end of the First World War the danger of Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism would disappear forever? If so, his mistake was catastrophic, for not he but Palacký was in the right. It is difficult to imagine on what grounds Masaryk switched over after 1914 to an attitude so different from his own past ideas. His views in 1915 were clearly expressed in his first note addressed to the British Foreign Office on April 15th of that year: **"Now Bohemia wishes and hopes that her Russian brethren will soon succeed in occupying the Bohemian and Slovak districts. . . . They must, however, on no account enter Bohemia except to stay."** Prophetic words, expressing a wish which has since been fulfilled.

Whatever his reasons, the fact remains that Masaryk's activities in the Allied countries during the First World War have become a model for many of the exiled politicians of today. With considerable skill and the help of only a few friends he succeeded in enlisting the support of a large part of the Western press for his plans. Several hundreds of thousands of Czechs who had been settled for years in America and other Allied countries

took the place of the Czech people at home, on whom he had no influence, and organized demonstrations and passed resolutions by acclamation which were presented to the Allied governments as proof of the will of the people. In Russia, and later also in France and Italy, Czech military formations were organized. Associations were formed and congresses were held to further the program for the "liberation of the oppressed nations," and prominent Allied personalities, invited to play leading parts in them, were so flattered that they did not realize their names were being misused for propaganda purposes by a group of ambitious adventurers. Closer and closer the nets of intrigue were drawn round the Western statesmen, who were also influenced by the idea that the breeding of national revolutions in the Danubian Empire would shorten the war, and when it ended, in 1918, were unable to rid themselves of the promises they had so light-heartedly given to exiled politicians, although many of them had foreseen the results of the destruction of the Habsburg Monarchy.

No doubt Masaryk's name is graven deeply in the history of all Danubian peoples, for his conspiracies shattered the nucleus of the Danubian Empire — the Union of Bohemia, Hungary, and Austria. It will always remain one of the great questions of history whether the Empire would have fallen asunder spontaneously, or under the influence of foreign propaganda, and there are enough arguments for and against both theories to support never-ending discussion. The territorial claims of Italy, Serbia, and Rumania would certainly have deprived it of important provinces, but would not have destroyed its nucleus. The fact is that the Allies officially recognized the Czecho-Slovak government while the war was still in progress; and Masaryk took advantage of this circumstance to present his own people with a **fait accompli**. Instead of having to negotiate with the elected representatives of the peoples the exiled politicians were themselves declared to be legal representatives.

The Treaty by means of which the Peace Conference established the new State was entitled: "**Traité entre les Puissances Alliées et la Tchéco-Slovaquie,**" and was signed

at Saint Germain on September 9, 1919. As soon as Dr. Beneš got hold of this document the proper name of the new State as it appeared in the original text — **Czecho-Slovakia** — vanished, and the name **Czechoslovakia** appeared for the first time. This may appear to be only a small change in nomenclature, but behind it is hidden one of the greatest bluffs in history. The peoples of the world believe in a nation which has never existed, but was conjured up by trickery and treachery and maintained by propaganda, **for there are no Czechoslovaks, only Czechs and Slovaks.** The change in the name of the new Republic was inserted into the Constitution by the first Czecho-Slovak Parliament, which was approved on February 20, 1920, but at that time Slovakia was occupied by the Czech army, and the leader of the Slovaks, Father Hlinka, was still in a Czech prison at Mirov in Moravia.

### **No Lawful Representatives**

The "lawful representatives" who voted for the Constitution were anything but lawful, for the members of the first Parliament were not elected but appointed by the political clique headed by Masaryk, which came to power with the help of the Allies. Over 4.5 million Germans, Hungarians, and people of other nationalities, were without a single representative in this "National Assembly," all claims on their behalf having been ignored by the Czechs.

All the fundamental provisions of the Constitution, concerning social reform, the expropriation of land, etc., and the language to be used officially, were determined by this arbitrarily formed body without a single German-Bohemian or Hungarian voice being heard. To remove all possibility of amendments to the Constitution being approved against the will of the Czechs, it was decreed that a two-thirds majority would be required. After the Constitution had been ratified, the nominated Assembly was dissolved and four weeks later elections were held for a new Parliament. Father Hlinka, elected while still in prison, was thereupon released. At the first sitting the Slovak members demanded the implementation of the

Pittsburgh Treaty, but were told that it was contrary to the Czecho-Slovak Constitution, and the Treaty was invalid because it was signed by people who were already American citizens. Thus was Czecho-Slovakia created, the "island of democracy in Danubian Europe," and Masaryk, who only a few years before had sharply criticized the smallest injustice in the Vienna Parliament, did not utter a word of protest.

From the inception of the new Republic a religious antagonism developed between Czechs and Slovaks which was of much more importance than the national one. The Slovak character has been decisively influenced by Catholicism, while the religious beliefs of the Czechs owe too much to Jan Hus to allow them to become willing subjects to Rome. The founders of Czecho-Slovakia, Masaryk and Beneš, were free-thinkers, and the numerous quarrels in which they soon became involved with the neighboring Catholic countries, mainly Hungary, soon brought them up against the Vatican, while no more promising foundation could be found for the national tradition they wished to establish than a return to Hussitism. So a new "National Czechoslovak Church" was founded.

Between the two wars, Dr. Beneš was one of the leading lights of European diplomacy. He hated Austria and Hungary, feared any sort of federation of the Danubian States, and obstinately upheld the fiction of "Czechoslovak" unity. He conspired with anyone and everyone — Rumanians, Yugoslavs, Russians, and Frenchmen — but he never tried to reach an understanding with his immediate neighbors, the Austrians and Hungarians, the most natural thing for him to have done. Czecho-Slovakia's internal situation also became more difficult. The collapse of Masaryk's State in 1939 was inevitable, because the German, Slovak, and Hungarian minorities could not be expected to defend a regime which they regarded as an oppressor. The widespread belief that Czecho-Slovakia could have survived but for the Munich capitulation is unfounded, and is only one of the many propaganda legends which have become accepted as fact.

It remains to be seen whether the West will continue

to support the ambitions of a few exiled politicians who may or may not represent the wishes and interests of their peoples. It is not surprising that many Czech politicians find it easier to make political capital out of the Masaryk legend than to follow an entirely new line, but would it not be advisable to eliminate this myth from Western propaganda and make no more use of names which bear a heavy responsibility for disrupting the unity of the Danubian region? It is difficult to see how the creation of a new Europe can be assisted by the memory of people whose narrow nationalism had such a baneful influence on the course of history. Politicians of Masaryk's type are very often public dangers, for they rouse peoples to revolt and then fail through weakness to guide the forces they have had conjured up in a suitable direction. A new spirit is needed; the entire Central European problem must be settled on a basis of **what** is right and not **who** is right.

Political actions should be judged by their results and not by the nationality of those responsible for them, and usually it is at least a generation before the true nature of these results becomes apparent. Viewed from this distance in time, it is obvious that Masaryk's "liberation" led to the balkanization of Central Europe and that the treaties of 1919 created a situation incomparably worse than the one they were supposed to remedy.

• • •

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND EXILES

Hans Schütz

Emigrants are to be pitied. Anyone forced to leave his home because of danger to life and limb deserves our sincerest sympathy. I can even feel for those emigrants who were at one time my bitter political opponents. The right to asylum is one of the human rights; so is the right to one's homeland. Exiles should, in their own interest, beware of treating human rights too lightly. By consigning them to the flames, we burn with them the right to asylum. He who breaks a principle should not complain if the stigma of Cain marks his brow.



One Mr. Pejskar, now employed with Radio Free Europe at Munich, might well ponder that thought. He edits in his spare time a Czech emigré paper **České Slovo** (The Czech Word). This "Czech word" was once the official organ of the Czech National Socialists, the party of Edward Beneš. **České Slovo** strives to perpetuate previous policies. On June 1, 1960 — issue No. 6 — it carried a memorandum of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia on "Czechoslovak-German Relations." The article depicts the expulsion of the Sudeten German people as final, as the best and only possible solution of the difficulties in that area. The western powers, including the West German Federal Republic, are implored to recognize at long last this irrevocable fact. Otherwise, "if the removal of the Sudeten Germans should not be considered definitive, Germany would exclude herself from the community of free nations and become a destroyer, instead of a co-rebuilder, of Europe's future. The West must stick to its agreement on the deportations and regard the Sudeten German question as settled. For tactical reasons the free world must reject the demand of the Sudeten Germans (to be allowed to return and see realized the right to the homeland)."

These phrases comprise the core of a memorandum which for the time being seems to be the last act of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, broken up again despite its dollar-filled cheque-book. **Democracy and Socialism**, organ of the Czech Social Democrats in exile, reports that the following leading members have voluntarily left the Council: Dr. J. Lettrich, chairman of the plenary assembly; F. Nemec, Dr. Osuský, Dr. Belluš, Dr. Fraštacký, Dr. Hodža (son of Milan Hodža), V. Jedinec, Dr. Černý (son-in-law of Švehla and former minister of the interior), J. Macek, A. Heidrich, Dr. Procházka, V. Majer. It has also been learned that Ferentšik, representative of the Carpatho-Ukrainians, has likewise quit the Council.

In other words, practically all representatives of the Slovaks, Carpatho-Ukrainians, Czech Agrarians, People's Party, Social Democrats, and Artisans Party have withdrawn. Mr. Zenkl and his party friends are the sole remnant. We do not know whether the Council ran aground

on the memorandum. Naturally, the recalcitrants will not voice their disagreement aloud. Nobody these days dares to differ publicly. Yet there are a few who feel ashamed of debasing — by the printed word — the principle of human rights in a world worthy of subsistence only and as long as human rights are heeded. The memorandum has caused a crisis among Czech exiles. The German public, without being overly concerned, should lodge due protest to this paper.

We have reason to believe that in May, 1960, Dr. Zenkl intended to visit leading German politicians. These men are engaged in a gigantic struggle on behalf of their people for the right of self-determination. Doesn't Dr. Zenkl surmise that, by refusing the right of self-determination to the Germans from Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, he puts the German statesmen in a precarious position? One cannot negotiate in a dubious or indirect way on the sell-out of the right of self-determination with politicians who stand or fall with the principle of self-determination.

Dr. Zenkl is not only a representative member of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia; he presently also presides over the Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN). The delegation of that assembly of enslaved European nations hurriedly assured a Munich newspaper that said delegation's Bonn office disavows the memorandum in question. And it immediately asked the New York bureau to clarify the statement as being, at most, the opinion of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia under Dr. Zenkl, but by no means the attitude of ACEN and the great majority of its members. Mr. Zenkl and his trusting entourage are travelling a fateful road indeed!

Despite everything, we still feel that in a new Europe genuine reconciliation between Germany and her eastern neighbors is possible. About a year ago, in a London exile paper, a Czech member of ACEN likened the Sudeten Germans to withered grass on the roadside to be tread into the ground or swept away by the wind. This demark by the honorable Mr. Rehák shows poetical talent but little political insight. The two millions of Sudeten Germans

who, impoverished and wrecked in body and soul, sought refuge in the West German Federal Republic, did not become the dynamite they were designed for by the mighty Stalin and the less mighty Beneš. As a rule the expellees proved a valuable and constructive element in the economic and political revival of Germany. They likewise bore witness of their friendship for the Czech emigrants who came after them.

It is a shabby business, indeed, when the Czechs — now fifteen years after the war's end — try to further the cause of Bolshevism by demanding from the free nations, and even the German community, complete disregard for the just claim of the Sudeten German expellees.

• • •

### WHERE ALL ROADS END

The Swiss daily **Neue Zürcher Zeitung** gives its readers a glimpse across Austria's border into the Bohemian Forest, ČSSR:

What would the former professor and representative to the Austro-Hungarian Reichstag in Vienna, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, say today if he could see what has become of the State he founded, the former Czecho-Slovak Republic? A kindly fate beckoned him — in the year 1937 at the age of 87 — to another world. He may have sensed what was to come, did not have to see the day, however, when the State, of which he was the founder and long-time president, was crushed by Hitler in 1938–39 and set up again in 1945, subsequently to be placed under the yoke of world Communism by politicians subservient to the Kremlin.

His son, Jan Masaryk, lived to see the great tragedy of his fatherland: destruction under Hitler, resurrection in 1945 in the shadow of Russian bayonets and the expulsion of more than three million Germans living near its borders in the Sudeten areas, at home there for centuries. At the end of this series of events came the final Bolshevization that gave his country the kiss of death.

Was it the guilt of the father, Thomas Masaryk, who gave President Wilson in 1918 a false picture of the population structure in the German regions claimed for the new

Czecho-Slovak Republic, which took revenge on the son and his people? Jan Masaryk, son of the "father of the Czechs," foreign minister till 1948, committed suicide at the onset of the country's final Bolshevization. At that time the iron curtain rang down on the western and southern borders of the Czech State. The border to West Germany and Austria was also closed off for the Czech people. The threads were cut, the contacts severed. The expression "people's prison" was not coined in vain.

The fields in the Czech border areas have been neglected for miles around; the meadows are brown and uncut. Houses and villages have been destroyed, levelled to the ground. Here all that one sees of a former house are a heap of stones; the ruins of a wall tell of a destroyed village or borough. Nowhere does one realize as keenly the deceptiveness of the system, nowhere as here at the frontier does talk of coexistence become such an empty phrase, and the babble about peace and freedom the butt of scornful laughter of an inhuman world.

• • •

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Frances McPoyne, M.A.**, is a sociologist and researcher, residing in Munich.

**Dr. Fraňo Tiso**, former ambassador of the Slovak Republic to Moscow, is the chairman of the Slovak National Council in Germany and the publisher of the Munich "Slobodné Slovensko" (Free Slovakia).

**F. O. Miksche**, former Czech Army Colonel and Military attaché in Paris and Brussels, is now a lecturer and free lance writer.

**Hans Schütz**, member of the German Federal Parliament, is also co-chairman of the Sudeten German Council in Munich.

**Philip A. Hrobak**, editor of *Slovakia*, is also editor of the *Jednota* (The Union), the official organ of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the USA and Canada,

and the *Slovák v Amerike*, the oldest Slovak newspaper in America; from 1950 to the present time, he is also serving as president of the Slovak League of America.

**Dr. Joseph M. Kirschbaum**, former Chargé d'Affaires of Slovakia in Switzerland and Secretary-General of the Slovak People's Party, teaches at the University of Montreal, Canada. His book "Slovakia — Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe" was published in 1960 by Robert Speller and Sons, New York.

**Constantine Čulen**, former member of the Slovak Parliament and Slovak journalist, one of the most prolific Slovak writers, now resides in Florida.

**Karl Kern**, journalist, is chairman of the Sudeten Association in Malmö, Sweden.

## BOOK REVIEWS

## Slovak Aspirations

J. M. Kirschbaum: *Slovakia, Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe*. Robert Speller and Sons, N. Y., 1960, pp. 371, \$5.00.

Although written to enlighten and correct the warped political vision of those still convinced that Czechoslovakia was a "little Switzerland in the heart of Europe," this book may be recommended as a compact political history of Slovakia. Sudeten Germans will welcome its fair presentation of facts that corroborate their own version of what actually happened in the ČSR.

It is amazing that Czech propaganda was, and to a large extent still is, able to influence the thinking of millions of people — particularly the Anglo-Saxon world — to believe a myth that there is one "Czechoslovak" people.

Kirschbaum explodes this myth and traces the origins of Slovakia from its historic beginnings, unfolding before the reader a detailed and soundly referenced account of a proud, vital and highly cultured people from their earliest origins to the declaration of their independence in 1939, pleading for a new

order in Central Europe where two world wars were touched off.

"The campaign for democracy in Central and Eastern Europe," maintains Kirschbaum "can be successful only if it will not feature people who compromised and collaborated with Communism, but will engage representatives without chauvinistic and imperialistic tendencies who are fighting for a democratic order of Central Europe in which every nation will enjoy equality and freedom and which will safeguard its security from outside attacks."

The last third of the book is an appendage of documents, including diplomatic memoranda, speeches, reports to the Slovak Parliament, exchanges of telegrams with Hitler and other German Reich officials, 26 photographs, and agreements, resolutions and statements by the representatives of Americans of Slovak descent at conferences of the Slovak League of America, plus remarks by US Congressional leaders on the Slovak problem.

A dual leitmotiv throughout is the thesis that Slovakia

has at all eras of its history been a western-oriented people and has been sought after by other surrounding peoples who attempted, but unsuccessfully, to assimilate it. Today the Slovaks are still western-oriented interiorly and not assimilated, either by the Czechs or by the Soviets. Kirschbaum's book is another reminder and a convincing one, that fires are still burning in the hearts of a little people in Central Europe who, like the Irish whom they so strongly resemble, are keeping the faith that independence shall one day be theirs. Though captured by Communists, they have not compromised with them. May Joseph Kirschbaum's meritorious volume win friends for Slovakia and for their cause. — F. McPoyne, in "Sudeten Bulletin," Dec. 1960.

—o—

**B. S. Buc, Ph.D.: Slovak Nationalism; Published by the Slovak League of America, Middletown, Pa., 1960; pp. 67.**

Scholarly works on Slovakia in English language were, until recently, hard to find in American and Canadian libraries. Scholars in the field of Slavic studies somehow avoided the oldest civilized part of the Slavic world even though Slovakia's role in the

early Slavic civilization and in the nineteenth century Pan-Slavism deserved their attention.

Since the Second World War, lack of interest in things Slovak is gradually disappearing. While some basic works on literature, political and cultural history are still to be desired, there is a score of readable and reliable books for the general public as well as for the students of political history and civilization. Professor Buc's recent study on Slovak nationalism is one of the works which will be welcome by students of Central Eastern European history not only because of its scholarly nature but also because it is the first thesis on this subject in the English language.

From Seton-Watson to R. A. Kann and Gilbert Oddo, foreign scholars tackled the problem of Slovak nationalism, directly or indirectly, some of them, like Macartney for instance, were even very close to understand its origin and aims. There was, however, no serious attempt at presenting the significance of nationalist ideas methodically in Slovak history through the centuries and in various historical situations.



Although this reviewer is inclined to call the ideas which stand behind the present Slovak drive for national independence rather patriotism than nationalism, Professor Buc's analysis makes it clear that there are many distinctions between nationalism of some European countries and the "nationalism" of the Slovaks. "From the beginning of its existence, Slovak nationalism," says Professor Buc, "was nurtured by ideas which followed the revolutionary changes of medieval, feudal society and laid the foundation for the birth of new political systems which we call 'Western democracy' . . . it involves a loyal devotion to a native land, but as yet has not developed serious revolutionary characteristics." One may add that Slovak nationalism lacks also any tendency to expand or dominate other peoples, aiming merely at a full national independence of the Slovak people in its own state or in a federal union with other European nations.

Professor Buc explains methodically the origins, components, motives, and objectives of Slovak nationalism in the context of a European

and especially of a Central European political setting. There were geographical and historical reasons which provoked to life Slovakia's struggle along the lines of nationalistic ideas. Being a part of European modern thought, Slovak nationalism was stimulated also by the chauvinism of some of Slovakia's neighbors; its characteristics were, however, for a long time defensive in nature and objective. Speaking of conflicts of Slovak nationalism, the writer gives a picture of the Slovak struggle not only against Hungarian assimilative tendencies, but also of conflicts between Magyarized Slovaks and Slovak Pan-Slavists, and later between Slovak adherents of "Czechoslovakism" and Slovak autonomists, as well as of Slovak Lutherans versus Slovak Catholics. In a relatively small territory of Slovakia, nationalism became a more complex phenomenon that it would appear to foreign casual observers, although its principal aim remains a struggle for national identity and survival and, continuously, Slovak nationalism was marked by federative tendencies.

The chapter on the federative tendencies of Slovak na-

tionalism is one of the most instructive not only for a proper understanding of the nature of Slovak nationalism, but also for future developments in Central Eastern Europe. Being federative in its tendencies and objectives, Slovak nationalism is a constructive element and not a barrier preventing co-operation of peoples of Eastern Europe. In view of the fact that some neighbors of Slovakia tried to present the Slovak struggle for national independence as an attempt at "balkanization," Professor Buc's analysis gives justice to the facts and to Slovaks.

Professor Buc's study, which originally was prepared

as a thesis for his Master Degree in Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh follows the developments of Slovak nationalism to the very recent events in Slovakia under Communist domination. The work is written in a clear, forceful style, and its conclusions are based on a thorough knowledge of the subject, with references to a large number of works in several foreign languages. In the bibliography, works by Hans Kohn and R. A. Kann are missing, as well as some symposia (Strakhovský, Lednicki, Gross, etc.).

**J. M. Kirschbaum,**  
Université de Montréal.

• • •

#### WHO SAID IT?

"The Slovak League of America — its affiliated organizations and its individual membership — does not hate the Czech nation, as propagated by members of the Council (of Free Czechoslovakia). The Slovaks do not want anything that belongs to the Czechs. They do not want their national or religious traditions, their history or their language, and they covet not their lands. They recognize and respect the right of the Czech nation to full freedom and political independence. At the same time, however, and by the same token, they rightfully expect the Czech nation to recognize and respect the inherent right of the Slovak nation to full freedom and independence, to a politically independent Slovak Republic. Free and 'Czechoslovak' simply don't rhyme!" — (P. A. Hrobak, letter to Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, July 10, 1953).